

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 9, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 8 (legislative day of February 5), 1932

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Ogden L. Mills, of New York, to be Secretary of the Treasury, vice Andrew W. Mellon.

UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Arthur A. Ballantine, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury, vice Ogden L. Mills.

CONSUL GENERAL

Wilbur Keblinger, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a consul, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Leonard E. Wales, of Delaware, to be United States attorney, district of Delaware. (He is now serving in this position under an appointment which expired December 15, 1931.)

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Gerald A. Jewett, of Des Moines, Iowa, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Iowa in place of Lars E. Bladine, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Capt. James T. Moore to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of February, 1931.

Capt. John M. Arthur to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of May, 1931.

Capt. Thomas P. Cheatham to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of June, 1931.

Capt. Louis W. Whaley to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of June, 1931.

Capt. William C. James to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July, 1931.

Capt. Thomas E. Bourke to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September, 1931.

Capt. LeRoy P. Hunt to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September, 1931.

Capt. Clifton B. Cates to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October, 1931.

First Lieut. Lloyd R. Pugh to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of January, 1931.

First Lieut. Vernon M. Guymon to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of January, 1931.

First Lieut. William W. Scott, jr., to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of February, 1931.

First Lieut. Paul R. Cowley to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March, 1931.

First Lieut. Edward G. Hagen to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March, 1931.

First Lieut. James L. Denham to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 12th day of April, 1931.

First Lieut. Frank P. Snow to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of May, 1931.

First Lieut. George D. Hamilton to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of June, 1931.

First Lieut. Lemuel A. Haslup to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of June, 1931.

First Lieut. Norman E. True to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July, 1931.

First Lieut. Robert S. Pendleton to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of July, 1931.

First Lieut. George L. Maynard to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of July, 1931.

First Lieut. Carl W. Meigs to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of August, 1931.

First Lieut. Floyd W. Bennett to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September, 1931.

First Lieut. Edwin U. Hakala to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September, 1931.

First Lieut. Brady L. Vogt to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of October, 1931.

Second Lieut. Francis J. McQuillen to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of August, 1931.

Second Lieut. Edward W. Snedeker to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of August, 1931.

Second Lieut. Kenneth W. Benner to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September, 1931.

Second Lieut. John S. E. Young, jr., to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September, 1931.

Second Lieut. Kenneth H. Cornell to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September, 1931.

Second Lieut. Arthur H. Butler to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September, 1931.

Second Lieut. Nels H. Nelson to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of September, 1931.

Second Lieut. Russell N. Jordahl to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of September, 1931.

Second Lieut. Chester B. Graham to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 26th day of September, 1931.

Second Lieut. Mortimer S. Crawford to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October, 1931.

Second Lieut. Benjamin F. Kaiser, jr., to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December, 1931.

Second Lieut. Elmer H. Salzman to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December, 1931.

Second Lieut. Thomas A. Wornham to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of January, 1932.

Second Lieut. Thomas B. Jordan to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of February, 1932.

Quartermaster Clerk Willis V. Harris to be a chief quartermaster clerk in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant, from the 11th day of October, 1931.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Glory be to Thee, O Lord Most High. May all the ends of the earth remember and turn unto the Lord and all the kindred of the nations worship before Thee. In Thee may they trust, and let them never be put to shame. May this Congress feel how very important its place is. Deliver us from any lack of earnestness and enthuse us with the responsibility of true manhood. Keep in all our hearts the declarations and the counsels of God. We pray for any who be bearing burdens that they may be enabled to bear them courageously. Thou who art the infinite face of love, hope, and light, fill our own beloved land and the whole earth with Thy glory and come and reign over all. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 5, 1932, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 70. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to construct a free overhead viaduct across the Mahoning River at Struthers, Mahoning County, Ohio;

H. R. 149. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near The Dalles, Oreg.;

H. R. 225. An act providing for payment of \$25 to each enrolled Chippewa Indian of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States:

H. R. 474. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.;

H. R. 4695. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Culbertson, Mont.;

H. R. 4696. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River southerly from the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation at or near the point known and designated as the Power-site Crossing, in the State of Montana;

H. R. 5131. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near and above the city of New Orleans, La.;

H. R. 5471. An act authorizing Sullivan County, Ind., to construct, maintain, and operate a public toll bridge across the Wabash River at a point in said county to a point opposite on the Illinois shore;

H. R. 5478. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.;

H. R. 5626. An act authorizing the States of Minnesota and North Dakota, the county of Polk, Minn., the county of Grand Forks, N. Dak., or any one or more of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Red River of the North at or near Bygland, Minn.;

H. R. 5878. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission, and the Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., and the Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a combination highway and railroad bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.;

H. R. 6663. An act to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Skull Valley Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7225. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of county commissioners of Allegheny County, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River between the city of Pittsburgh and the borough of Homestead, Pa.; and

H. R. 7248. An act authorizing the modification of the existing project for the Willamette River between Oregon City and Portland, Oreg.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 12. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay certain claims against the District of Columbia;

S. 14. An act to amend chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to the condemnation of land for public use;

S. 188. An act for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works;

S. 279. An act to excuse certain persons from residence upon homestead lands during 1929, 1930, and 1931 in the drought-stricken areas;

S. 366. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis H. DeBayle;

S. 486. An act conferring jurisdiction upon certain courts of the United States to hear and determine the claim by the owner of the 4-masted auxiliary bark *Quevilly* against the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 800. An act for the relief of Ellingson & Groskopf (Inc.);

S. 1040. An act authorizing the issuance to Margaret McCreanor of a patent for certain lands;

S. 1203. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society United States Daughters of 1812 in the District of Columbia;

S. 1216. An act for the relief of the owner of the barge *Mary M*;

S. 1436. An act for the relief of the Copper Ridge Mining Co.;

S. 1438. An act to authorize the sale of land on the Camp McDowell Indian Reservation to the city of Phoenix, Ariz., for use in connection with its water-supply development, and for other purposes;

S. 2396. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington;

S. 2498. An act to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over public land in the District of Columbia;

S. 2622. An act to provide an examination and survey of Seaside Harbor, Oreg.;

S. 2909. An act for the relief of Ross E. Adams;

S. 2985. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Connecticut River State Bridge Commission, a statutory commission of the State of Connecticut created and existing under the provisions of special Act No. 496 of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, 1931 session, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Connecticut River;

S. 3111. An act validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes;

S. 3132. An act to extend the times for the commencement and completion of the bridge of the county of Norman and the town and village of Halstad, in said county, in the State of Minnesota, and the county of Traill and the town of Herberg, in said county, in the State of North Dakota, across the Red River of the North on the boundary line between said States;

S. 3237. An act to legalize a bridge across the Mississippi River at Grand Rapids, Minn.;

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution for the improvement of Chevy Chase Circle with a fountain and appropriate landscape treatment;

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution granting the consent of Congress for the temporary removal to the Corcoran Art Gallery of certain portraits in the Capitol Building; and

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to correct certain errors in the reenrollment of the bill (S. 2199) exempting building and loan associations from being adjudged bankrupts.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 201) entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of South Carolina to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Waccamaw River."

LOANS TO FARMERS BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act provides that \$50,000,000 shall be set aside for the purpose of aiding agriculture. The Department of Agriculture has provided rules and regulations governing the method that will be employed in loaning this money. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of these regulations may be inserted in the Record at this point so that Members and the people of the country generally will know the exact procedure to be followed to obtain this aid.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are these regulations prepared by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman state whether or not this is the final report of the Department of Agriculture on these regulations?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I will not say it is the final report, but it is the report which gives the rules and regulations that are necessary to follow in order to obtain this money.

Mr. KETCHAM. The point I have in mind is this: I think I am correct in stating that this is sent up merely as a suggested plan, with a view of asking suggestions from Members of Congress, and that this is not the final revision, and that within a very few days, possibly four or five, the final revision will come out.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I will read what the letter of transmittal says:

I am inclosing herewith a copy of the regulations which it is proposed to issue under the authority of section 2 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act, approved January 22, 1932, to make loans to farmers to finance crop production in 1932.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR M. HYDE,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. If these are the final regulations, it seems to me the better way would be to have them printed as a public document.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I think the gentleman's suggestion is a good one provided this information is made available.

Mr. SNELL. I suggest the gentleman take that up with the Printing Committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including a statement sent to him by the Department of Agriculture showing the method by which it is proposed to administer the loans under the \$50,000,000 fund provided in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] says that these are not the final regulations. What is the use of printing them unless they are?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Inasmuch as they have gone into detail here, unless there is some opposition or additional suggestions, I take it that these will be the final rules and regulations governing the loaning of this money. I have no desire to clutter up the RECORD with anything that ought not to be printed in it, but I think this is very important, and we are receiving requests from all over the country asking for these facts.

Mr. SNELL. I think the gentleman should put it through the Printing Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADDRESS OF HON. TOM YON, OF FLORIDA

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a speech delivered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YON] at the Democratic conference at Marianna, Fla., November 28, 1931.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Hon. TOM YON at the Democratic conference at Marianna, Fla., November 28, 1931:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, this is an assemblage of Democrats to promote the best interest of the party, both of State and Nation. The records of the Republican Party for the past 10 years or more has been one in which they have tried one expediency after another, trying to solve world problems which they themselves have created and brought about by their selfish political chicanery in their effort to destroy the Democratic Party and discredit its great war President during the years immediately following the armistice.

The leadership of Mr. Lodge, Republican, and his force in the Senate started the struggle that has led to the present economic conditions in the world. From time to time the racial and national animosities of our citizens, who have sprung from one European nation or another, were excited to such an extent that they did not consider reason nor the best interests of the Nation in trying to get even with the Democratic Party, under whose leadership we had fought the war to successful conclusion. Many of our population, being of stock of our enemy, as well as some of our dissatisfied allied nations were so aroused by the misrepresentation of the enemies of the President and of the Democratic Party that they were led to do in this country the very thing that has led up to the undoing of their fatherland. They aided in defeating not only the Democratic Party but the principles for which the Democratic Party stood.

Following the separate treaty with the leader of the Central Powers in the war and the unrest that became evident in Europe, followed by France's move into the Valley of the Ruhr, we were given the Dawes, the Young plan, and now the moratorium, which the present head of the Republican Party offered as another temporary expediency for the ills of this country, expecting to get by to-day and let to-morrow take care of itself, as well as the rest of the world. I mention these facts, that the sources from which our economic difficulties come, because Republicans

are now urging to escape responsibilities for what they have done by claiming that our troubles are all on account of the world-wide depression. I want you to understand that the party that has been in power, in full charge of the Government for the past 11 years, is entirely responsible for these conditions, and the people are coming to know it. The day of judgment is at hand, and the Republicans are trying to find an alibi.

Then what else? We remember what happened in connection with Teapot Dome, and the little black bag sent by Doheny, and the acceptance of same, and for which Mr. Fall is now serving a little time, also Mr. Sinclair's jail sentence, as a fact of the outcome of those scandalous times of Harding's administration.

The 8 or 10 years following, 1921 to 1929, Wall Street international bankers took advantage of market for foreign loans and marketed billions of dollars of European securities here to our American citizens, for which these bankers derived great profit in the way of commissions. They are now endeavoring to create sentiment for cancellation of foreign debts due our Government for no other reason than that possibly the loans through Wall Street might be collected from the nations of Europe while the people pay in taxes what the foreign nations owe to us. I am against such on the part of our Government.

In 1927 I was in New York and got hold of a copy of a New York paper in which was a news story in the financial section of that paper that stated that 20 banks on Wall Street had made a profit of over \$70,000,000 in marketing securities of foreign governments. This did not include the interest on the bonds. These same bankers acting as agents to obtain from foreign nations oil and other concessions that persons high in official position in this Republican administration might be beneficiaries to a large extent.

In the meantime, prior to the crash in the fall of 1929, a bull market was in progress; consolidations, mergers, and combines, encouraged by optimistic assurance by Republicans, were the order of the day. Billions of stock were unloaded on the public, was permitted by the administration in power—the Republicans. Widows and orphans, working people, old people were deceived and lost their last penny. With the stocks marketed hardly able to return 1 per cent on one-fourth of the value, and the administration in Washington, either in the Treasury or other departments, giving encouragement to the bulls by handing out statements that the foundation of business was firm and sufficiently strong to maintain such a market, the substance of the Nation was sucked into the world stream, when all along they, the administration leaders, should have known better.

Of course the economic life of our country was not on a safe basis, for at that time agriculture was in a depressed condition. Farm values had decreased around \$10,000,000,000 in value since the beginning of 1921. Banks, especially in the agricultural States, had failed by the hundreds. Farmers were in debt, farm mortgages being foreclosed, and all of that, yet with a rank speculation on one side, and mortgage foreclosures on the other; and even though the administration in Washington should have known that such a lopsided economic condition could not stand, yet encouraging statements to the very last were handed out; and even after the crash in the fall of 1929, these leaders kept up the chorus, and are even now, with millions out of employment and farm commodity prices at almost their lowest in over 30 years, saying that business is on the upgrade.

I say that the Republican Party and big business has failed dismally in keeping this country in a condition whereby want and misery will have no place within its bounds. The practice of running the Government in the interest of special privilege to make the rich richer and the poor poorer is all wrong.

In so far as the Republican Party being a party of prosperity, that myth has been exploded. Of course, in the past many voters in America have been intimidated around election times by bosses of industrial corporations, who would pass the word around that if a Democrat was elected for President on election day that their plants would be shut down. These workers from now on will have a mind of their own. They have gone through these sad experiences, which have brought them to where they are to-day—with shops closed and no employment, not a chance to earn something whereby loved ones may be fed and clothed. In my own State some Democrats I have heard remark in campaigns prior to 1928 that they voted the Democratic ticket but hoped the Republicans would win, for it would mean better business and good times. I wonder how this class of Democrats feel about it now? I have always charged that this Republican prosperity myth was unfair, that the Democratic Party is equal, if not superior, in strength in its leadership in directing the affairs of a democratic government and in safety and security to honorable business.

Now, it will become the duty of the Democratic Party, I believe, and be their responsibility to elect a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress in 1932 to set this Government, business, and the economic life on their feet again, and our people will be given an opportunity to work out their salvation under equal opportunity. It will be a great responsibility. Under the last Democratic administration the Democrats put on the statute books some of the most beneficial legislation that this Nation has ever had the privilege to enjoy. Under the last Democratic administration the Federal reserve banking law was given us, and if it wasn't for it now I don't know what would have happened to us when this so-called depression broke upon us.

The Democrats in the House and the Democrats in the Senate in present Congress will have a constructive program, and the Democrats will support that program. In this connection, though, you must not expect too much of a Democratic House with a slender majority while the same Republican President is in the

White House that was there when these troublous times came upon us, and also a Republican Senate; so just consider again that the Republicans are in power, but the Democrats will not attempt to retard but help work the country out of its present deplorable condition.

Now, we want to always as Democrats strive to perpetuate the principles of the founder of our party. Our party nationally needs the help of the Democrats of our State as well as of other States of the Union. Let us not divide and waste our strength in nonessential bickerings. There are too many fundamentals upon which the party strength ought to stand; and as a warning to all Americans, I will say, that sooner or later we will fail in our purpose and in the carrying on of a democratically operated government if the principles of the founder of our party is not maintained. The Nation needs the Democratic Party, for if we do not have a liberal Democratic Party fighting for and maintaining those Democratic principles that made our Nation great, then there is no telling what will become of it. Then let's all unite for the success of our party in both State and Nation, and not alone for sake of party victory, but for another and more patriotic purpose, and that is that our State and Nation are calling to us to restore our Government that it might again serve and be for all the people, truly a government of, for and by the people, equal rights to all, and special privileges to none.

SALARIES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, at my request the Bureau of Efficiency has prepared a table, bringing it down to date,

showing the number and amount of salaries of civilian employees of the executive branch of the Government and of the military personnel. It is prepared in a number of groups, showing the number of people who receive less than \$1,000, and the amount paid for that group, and dividing all the employees into groups up to \$15,000 and over. This table does not show the number of employees and their salaries of the legislative branch of the Government for the reason that the Bureau of Efficiency does not have that information. Neither does it include the Members of the House and the Senate and their salaries and the salaries and number of their clerks, and so forth.

Later on I expect to obtain that information as to the legislative branch, and later will ask unanimous consent to print that in the RECORD.

I now ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD this table to which I have referred, for the information of the Members and for purposes of study.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The table is as follows:

Number and cost of salaries of (a) civilian employees of the executive branch of the Government, and (b) military personnel
[Compiled in January, 1932, from latest available information]

Annual rate of pay ¹		Both civil and military				Civil				Military			
Not less than	But less than	Number ²		Salary cost ⁴		Number ²		Salary cost ⁴		Number ²		Salary cost ⁴	
		Number in group (b)	Cumulative total (c)	Cost for group (d)	Cumulative cost ⁵ (e)	Number in group (f)	Cumulative total (g)	Cost for group (h)	Cumulative cost ⁵ (i)	Number in group (j)	Cumulative total (k)	Cost for group (l)	Cumulative cost ⁵ (m)
\$0.00	\$1,000.00	345,351	1,023,373	\$154,846,967.25	\$1,315,690,467.12	124,678	732,460	\$43,303,021.57	\$1,055,970,636.55	220,673	2,009,913	\$111,537,945.68	\$259,719,830.57
1,000.00	1,100.00	59,234	678,022	20,468,073.28	1,160,843,499.87	56,883	607,782	18,038,396.80	1,012,661,614.98	2,351	70,240	2,429,676.48	148,181,884.89
1,100.00	1,200.00	26,528	618,788	28,883,355.40	1,140,375,428.59	12,157	550,899	12,319,482.44	994,623,218.18	14,371	67,889	16,563,872.66	146,752,203.41
1,200.00	1,300.00	44,503	592,260	41,262,606.34	1,111,492,071.19	37,558	583,742	32,243,740.84	982,303,735.74	7,351	53,518	9,048,955.50	129,183,535.45
1,300.00	1,400.00	21,140	547,351	22,865,154.58	1,070,199,374.85	20,243	501,184	21,647,211.78	950,059,994.90	897	46,167	1,217,942.80	120,139,379.95
1,400.00	1,500.00	27,762	526,211	32,708,889.97	1,047,334,220.27	24,643	480,941	28,273,105.49	928,412,783.12	3,119	45,270	4,435,784.48	118,921,437.15
1,500.00	1,600.00	27,855	498,449	38,442,723.88	1,014,625,330.30	24,044	456,298	32,562,998.76	896,139,677.63	3,851	42,151	5,879,725.12	114,486,652.67
1,600.00	1,700.00	31,446	470,554	48,214,483.56	976,182,603.42	28,339	432,254	43,120,969.84	867,576,678.87	3,057	38,300	5,063,513.72	109,605,927.55
1,700.00	1,800.00	21,942	439,108	36,028,965.82	927,968,122.86	20,028	403,865	32,712,739.90	824,455,709.03	1,914	35,243	3,316,225.92	103,512,413.83
1,800.00	1,900.00	42,684	417,166	75,502,724.17	891,939,157.04	35,690	383,837	62,612,587.73	791,742,969.13	6,964	33,221	12,850,136.44	100,196,187.91
1,900.00	2,000.00	33,001	374,482	60,502,418.78	810,436,432.87	32,776	348,147	60,060,238.59	729,130,381.40	225	23,335	442,159.23	87,305,051.47
2,000.00	2,100.00	25,267	341,481	50,711,574.31	755,934,014.69	24,186	313,371	48,530,825.91	669,070,112.82	1,081	23,110	2,180,745.40	86,863,901.27
2,100.00	2,200.00	118,759	316,214	247,086,923.94	705,222,439.78	116,759	291,185	242,864,839.74	620,539,286.91	2,000	25,029	4,222,084.23	84,683,152.57
2,200.00	2,300.00	16,384	197,455	36,211,572.64	458,135,515.84	13,078	174,421	28,858,487.00	591,774,447.17	3,305	23,029	7,353,085.64	80,461,038.67
2,300.00	2,400.00	28,208	181,071	59,586,499.82	421,923,943.20	25,374	161,348	57,547,533.82	534,815,960.17	19,173	18,829	2,038,936.00	73,107,983.03
2,400.00	2,500.00	23,293	154,803	56,367,461.98	365,337,473.38	23,225	135,974	56,202,844.98	478,618,805.15	68	18,829	164,617.00	71,099,047.03
2,500.00	2,600.00	49,291	131,510	23,113,918.52	305,970,011.40	49,138	112,740	22,726,480.52	451,345,285.67	153	18,761	387,438.00	70,904,433.03
2,600.00	2,700.00	15,567	82,219	40,475,608.19	282,856,092.58	15,116	63,611	39,285,484.19	412,339,100.85	451	18,608	1,190,184.00	70,516,992.03
2,700.00	2,800.00	8,177	66,652	22,135,718.00	242,380,424.69	6,493	48,495	17,498,195.00	395,053,616.66	1,684	18,157	4,637,523.00	69,323,808.03
2,800.00	2,900.00	9,425	58,475	26,671,541.10	220,244,706.69	5,047	42,002	14,067,523.30	381,086,140.00	4,378	10,473	12,604,017.80	64,689,285.03
2,900.00	3,000.00	4,263	49,050	12,082,169.00	193,573,165.59	3,984	36,955	11,265,440.00	370,020,699.00	279	12,095	816,729.00	52,085,267.23
3,000.00	3,100.00	4,191	44,787	12,374,759.22	181,490,996.59	3,512	32,971	10,331,218.00	359,789,917.00	679	11,816	2,043,541.22	51,268,538.23
3,100.00	3,200.00	2,011	40,596	6,110,810.44	169,116,237.37	1,803	29,459	5,459,319.44	354,330,696.44	208	11,137	651,491.00	49,224,097.01
3,200.00	3,300.00	4,613	38,585	14,754,776.00	163,005,426.93	4,484	17,656	14,335,613.00	340,496,309.44	129	10,929	419,133.00	48,573,506.01
3,300.00	3,400.00	2,719	33,972	9,060,766.00	148,250,650.93	2,343	13,172	7,692,167.00	332,804,142.44	406	10,800	1,368,599.00	48,154,373.01
3,400.00	3,500.00	2,019	31,223	6,870,907.71	139,189,884.93	1,825	10,829	6,199,120.15	326,604,922.29	194	10,394	671,787.56	46,785,774.01
3,500.00	3,600.00	2,105	29,204	7,334,656.25	132,318,977.22	1,987	19,034	6,916,494.00	319,698,428.29	118	10,200	418,162.25	46,113,986.45
3,600.00	3,700.00	3,196	27,099	11,468,161.53	124,984,320.97	1,353	17,017	4,841,023.53	314,857,451.82	1,833	10,082	6,627,138.00	45,665,824.20
3,700.00	3,800.00	1,602	23,903	5,849,532.00	113,516,139.44	936	15,659	3,352,002.00	311,505,453.82	666	8,244	2,497,500.00	39,063,636.20
3,800.00	3,900.00	2,954	22,301	11,165,973.04	107,666,657.44	2,875	14,723	10,864,987.00	300,640,466.82	79	7,573	300,986.04	36,571,186.20
3,900.00	4,000.00	1,489	19,347	5,810,413.12	96,500,634.40	251	11,848	976,562.00	299,663,904.82	1,238	7,499	4,833,851.12	36,270,200.16
4,000.00	4,100.00	2,371	17,858	9,552,631.96	90,690,271.23	1,578	11,597	6,341,012.40	293,322,892.42	793	6,261	3,211,619.56	31,436,349.01
4,100.00	4,200.00	154	15,487	631,380.01	81,137,639.32	153	10,019	627,204.04	287,015,696.46	1	5,463	4,176.00	23,224,729.43
4,200.00	4,300.00	1,535	15,333	6,454,630.93	80,506,250.23	872	9,866	3,613,827.50	283,401,823.96	663	5,467	2,840,803.48	23,220,533.43
4,300.00	4,400.00	1,714	13,793	7,637,867.50	74,051,623.30	722	8,994	3,171,917.50	280,230,906.46	992	4,804	4,465,950.00	25,379,750.00
4,400.00	4,500.00	2,605	12,084	11,937,286.00	66,413,760.80	2,250	8,272	10,259,866.00	269,971,040.46	355	3,812	1,677,420.00	20,913,800.00
4,500.00	4,600.00	2,034	9,479	9,812,893.00	54,476,474.80	1,236	6,022	6,143,193.00	263,827,847.46	748	3,457	3,664,700.00	19,236,330.00
4,600.00	4,700.00	1,602	7,445	8,039,054.00	44,663,581.80	919	4,736	4,573,104.00	259,254,743.46	653	2,709	3,465,950.00	15,571,630.00
4,700.00	4,800.00	510	5,843	2,655,770.60	36,624,527.80	374	3,817	1,941,870.60	257,312,872.86	136	2,026	713,900.00	12,105,730.00
4,800.00	4,900.00	314	5,333	1,695,752.80	33,968,737.20	311	3,443	1,679,452.80	255,643,420.06	3	1,890	16,300.00	11,391,830.00
4,900.00	5,000.00	1,324	5,019	7,441,850.80	32,273,004.40	905	3,132	5,033,770.80	250,609,649.86	419	1,887	2,408,080.00	11,375,530.00
5,000.00	5,100.00	442	3,695	2,564,669.00	24,831,153.00	303	2,227	1,758,719.00	248,850,930.86	139	1,468	805,950.00	8,967,450.00
5,100.00	5,200.00	1,943	3,253	11,694,775.00	22,206,484.60	698	1,924	4,218,775.00	244,632,155.86	1,245	1,329	7,470,000.00	8,161,500.00
5,200.00	5,300.00	309	1,310	1,997,424.60	10,571,709.60	309	1,226	1,997,424.60	242,634,731.26	84	84	885,500.00	885,500.00
5,300.00	5,400.00	244	1,001	1,710,830.00	8,574,285.00	244	917	1,710,830.00	240,923,901.26	84	84	885,500.00	885,500.00
5,400.00	5,500.00	150	757	1,111,033.00	6,863,455.00	150	673	1,111,033.00	239,812,868.26	84	84	885,500.00	885,500.00
5,500.00	5,600.00	216	607	1,711,672.00	5,752,422.00	133	523	1,047,672.00	238,765,196.26	83	84	664,000.00	885,500.00
5,600.00	5,700.00	40	391	344,500.00	4,040,750.00	40	390	344,500.00	238,420,696.26	1	1	21,500.00	21,500.00
5,700.00	5,800.00	138	351	1,243,350.00	3,696,350.00	138	350	1,243,350.00	237,177,346.26	1	1	21,500.00	21,500.00
5,800.00	5,900.00	134	213	1,340,000.00	2,452,900.00	134	212	1,340,000.00	235,837,346.26	1	1	21,500.00	21,500.00
5,900.00	6,000.00	6	79	66,000.00	1,112,900.00	6	78	66,000.00	235,177,346.26	1	1	21,500.00	21,500.00
6,000.00	6,100.00	41	73	494,900.00	1,046,900.00	41	72	494,900.00	234,682,446.26	1	1	21,500.00	21,500.00
6,100.00	6,200.00	32	32	552,000.00	552,000.00	31	31	530,500.00	234,151,946.26	1	1	21,500.00	21,500.00

¹ The annual rate of pay of civilian employees is the gross rate of pay and includes annual allowances for quarters, subsistence, or other facilities or services furnished by the Government. The annual rate of pay of military personnel is the net rate of pay for both active and retired men. It does not include allowances as distinguished from pay.

² "Military" includes the military personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey.

³ The "number in group" indicated at each rate of pay includes seasonal and temporary employees.

⁴ The "cost for group" indicated at each rate of pay includes amounts

Mr. RAINEY. I also submit the following two letters I have received from the United States Bureau of Efficiency for the information of the Members:

UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY,
Washington, February 2, 1932.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RAINEY: Reference is made to your letter of January 15, 1932, relative to the amount that could be saved annually by reducing 10 per cent or 25 per cent the salaries of employees of the Federal Government receiving more than \$5,000 a year.

I inclose a table showing number and cost of salaries in the executive branch of the Government. This table, which includes both civil and military employees, was compiled by the Bureau of the Budget from the latest available information furnished by the departments and independent establishments.

I assume that it is the intention of your inquiry that no salary of more than \$5,000 would be reduced below \$5,000. Otherwise some persons receiving salaries above \$5,000 would be reduced to rates less than \$5,000 and to rates less than persons receiving salaries at \$5,000 and less, who would be subjected to no reduction in pay. On this basis, the amount that would be saved by reducing salaries in excess of \$5,000 10 per cent would be approximately \$3,487,876. The amount that would be saved by a similar 25 per cent reduction would be approximately \$6,012,865.

These estimates are computed as follows:

Ten per cent reduction above \$5,000

Reduction of \$5,000 to \$5,199 group to \$5,000.....	\$29,054
Reduction of \$5,200 to \$5,399 group to \$5,000.....	105,770
Reduction of \$5,400 to \$5,599 group to \$5,000.....	125,752
Reduction of \$5,600 and over group 10 per cent.....	3,227,300
	3,487,876

Twenty-five per cent reduction above \$5,000

Reduction of \$5,000 to \$5,199 group to \$5,000.....	\$29,054
Reduction of \$5,200 to \$5,399 group to \$5,000.....	105,770
Reduction of \$5,400 to \$5,599 group to \$5,000.....	125,752
Reduction of \$5,600 to \$5,799 group to \$5,000.....	821,850
Reduction of \$5,800 to \$5,999 group to \$5,000.....	354,669
Reduction of \$6,000 to \$6,499 group to \$5,000.....	1,979,775
Reduction of \$6,500 to \$6,999 group to \$5,000.....	425,424
Reduction of \$7,000 and over group, 25 per cent.....	2,143,571
	6,012,865

I shall be glad to furnish any further information that you may require.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT D. BROWN, Chief.

Inclosure.

UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY,
Washington, February 4, 1932.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RAINEY: In accordance with the verbal request you made to Mr. Littlejohn, of our staff, I am submitting an estimate of the annual savings that would be effected by reducing all Government salaries in excess of \$2,000 a year 10 per cent. This estimate is based on the table prepared by the Bureau of the Budget which was submitted to you with my letter dated February 2, 1932. Both civil and military employees are included.

Assuming that it is intended that no salary of more than \$2,000 be reduced below \$2,000, the amount that would be saved approximates \$55,382,465.

This estimate is computed as follows:

Reduction of \$2,000 to \$2,099 group to \$2,000.....	\$117,574
Reduction of \$2,100 to \$2,199 group to \$2,000.....	9,568,924
Reduction of \$2,200 to \$2,299 group to \$2,000.....	3,443,573
Reduction of \$2,300 and over 10 per cent.....	40,192,394

Total..... 55,382,465

The following table shows the number of employees under \$2,000 and the number at \$2,000 and over for both the District of Columbia and the field service.

	Civilian, commissioned, and enlisted personnel in the executive branch of the Federal Government	
	Number	Compensation
Under \$2,000 per annum.....	681,892	\$559,756,453.03
\$2,000 and over per annum.....	341,481	755,934,014.09
Total.....	1,023,373	1,315,690,467.12

¹As the highest standard salary rate in this group is \$5,400, this estimate is based upon a 10 per cent reduction for all employees in the group.

²As the highest standard salary rate in this group is \$2,200, this estimate is based upon a 10 per cent reduction for all employees in the group.

This is the same information contained in a recent letter from this bureau to Senator JONES, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT D. BROWN, Chief.

POLISH COLONIAL PATRIOTS

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a statement of our continental Polish heroes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, the names of two great Poles will be associated with the name of George Washington and the founding of the American Republic as long as history endures. They are Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Casimir Pulaski. Kosciuszko was the first of that noted galaxy of foreign officers who volunteered for the cause of the Colonies. Of this noted group only Pulaski and DeKalb gave their lives in the Revolution.

Kosciuszko and Pulaski, while imbued with the same ideals, differed widely in their personalities and in their military specialties. Kosciuszko was a highly trained technician, while Pulaski, although regarded as a military genius, was more of the dashing type whom men would follow cheerfully to their deaths. Both men are credited at different times with saving the American cause.

The beginning of the year 1777 was a dark period for the Continental Army. The troops were ill clad, ill fed, and had suffered one defeat after another. On top of this it was learned that General Burgoyne was coming down through New York State from the north. Gen. Horatio Gates commanded the American Army of the North. Kosciuszko, who had already demonstrated his ability in the fortification of Philadelphia, was connected with the Gates army as an engineer. Kosciuszko recommended that a battery be placed on the summit of Sugar Loaf Hill. Unfortunately for the Colonial officers, General Gates was relieved of this command, after he had approved the Kosciuszko plan of defense. His successor vetoed the plan, with disastrous results. After the commander who relieved Gates began to suspect that he had made a mistake he sent the same Colonel Wilkinson who later carried to Congress the report of the capture of Burgoyne to inspect the defenses. Wilkinson promptly wrote: "For the love of God, let Kosciuszko return here, and as quickly as possible." Unfortunately, this belated recommendation of Kosciuszko's plan of defense was too late. The English, already on Lake Champlain, themselves followed Kosciuszko's idea.

When Gates was restored to his command he commissioned Kosciuszko to devise a plan for the defense of Saratoga and to check the British advance. Kosciuszko fortified Bemis Heights. The Americans crushed Burgoyne's force in the Saratoga Valley, and hope flamed anew in the hearts of the colonists. Following this victory at Saratoga, one of the decisive engagements of history, many European powers recognized the independence of the United States, even though the war had not been concluded.

Historians point to Kosciuszko's part in this battle and in the preparation for it as showing his astounding worth to the American forces. A victory by Burgoyne at that time might easily have brought in its train complete defeat for the colonists and might have placed an entirely new face upon subsequent world history. General Gates eagerly acknowledged his indebtedness to Kosciuszko in his official report to Congress.

Kosciuszko's next task was the fortification of the heights of West Point. Radiere, described as an "impatient, petulant officer," was originally intrusted with the task. He planned it on too large a scale, accomplished little, and Kosciuszko was dispatched to the scene. The young Polish military engineer made many changes in the original plans and the work was pushed rapidly, to the satisfaction of all. By 1778 Kosciuszko had finished the gigantic task, and military men regarded West Point as impregnable. The importance of the fortification was that the Hudson River was the only passage by which the British could cooperate with an

army from Canada, and General Washington regarded this position as indispensable. He pointed out that upon its security depended America's chief supplies of flour for the armies.

In 1780 Thaddeus Kosciuszko was appointed chief engineer of the Army of the South, then commanded by Gen. Nathanael Greene. Greene found this army lacked clothing, food, and resources generally. He sent Kosciuszko to select a camp site. The Polish engineer picked out a spot at the head of navigation on the Pee Dee, in fertile country unspoiled by war. There the army rested and discipline and spirits were revived.

Kosciuszko retained this post until the end of the war. His duties generally were to survey the field of operations, determine sources of water and food supply, indicate strategic points of defense and attack, and devise means for rapid movement of troops and provisions. The difficulties of this assignment may be imagined when it is remembered that the army was operating in marshy regions, frequently encountering great swamps. The fighting often of necessity became guerilla warfare, and at those times, despite his rank, the brilliant young Polish engineer fought with the rest as a common soldier. Kosciuszko was not a soldier of fortune by any means. He did not present himself to Washington under any assumed title, although that was frequently done at that time. He asked for no rank, demanded no pay. He was given the rank of colonel of Engineers. Washington termed him "a gentleman of science and merit."

Kosciuszko's will, which he left with his friend, Thomas Jefferson, on his second and last departure from America, displayed a love of liberty extending to all peoples everywhere. While in Virginia he had seen slavery in all its phases. In his will he evidently foresaw a broader scope of human freedom in America than that for which he was himself disinterestedly battling in an alien land. The famous Kosciuszko will is recorded as one of the torches lighting the path of human progress. It follows:

I, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, being just on my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that, should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson, to employ the whole thereof in purchasing negroes from among his own slaves, or any others, and giving them liberty in my name; in giving them an education in trade or otherwise; in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality, which may make them good neighbors, good fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, in their duty as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country, of the good order of society, and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful; and I make the said Thomas Jefferson executor of this.

5th of May, 1798.

T. KOSCIUSZKO.

After the war closed, on the recommendation of Washington, Kosciuszko was given the rank of brigadier general for "long, faithful, and honorable service." Ranking with the class of officers second only to Washington and Greene, he with others was given a tract of land where the city of Columbus, capital of Ohio, now stands. Tributes and expressions of gratitude too numerous to detail were showered upon this foreign hero. Of the many foreign officers who fought in Washington's army, Kosciuszko was one of three selected as a member of the Society of Cincinnati.

Kosciuszko returned to his own country and in 1794 led a revolt to try to strike the shackles of alien governments from his own people, but failed, and spent his declining years, after a second visit to America, in Switzerland.

Casimir Pulaski came to America with a record of military daring already established in Europe, although still a very young man. Before he reached his majority he was a member of the guard of Duke Charles of Curland. When the Polish throne was vacant Russian forces moved toward Warsaw and many Poles resented this means of intimidation. They found a leader in Count Joseph Pulaski, who, in 1768, organized the Confederation of Bar, whose object was to vindicate the sovereign rights of Poland. The armed forces of the confederation actively opposed the puppet King placed on the throne, but the leader of this revolt, the father of Casimir Pulaski, was betrayed by treachery and died in prison in 1769.

Young Casimir had entered this fight at the age of 20, and on his father's death the chief command devolved upon him. The forces under Pulaski finally went down to defeat, and in 1772 Russia, Austria, and Prussia undertook the first partition of Poland.

Although he emerged defeated from this long campaign, young Casimir Pulaski had established an enviable reputation as a soldier and leader of men. Hounded from his own country by alien enemies, Pulaski sought out Benjamin Franklin and Silas Deane in Paris and engaged to enter the American cause to fight for the freedom denied his own people. A year passed before arrangements could be perfected, but in June, 1777, with Lieutenant Colonel Kotkowski, another Polish patriot, he sailed for America. Franklin wrote General Washington as follows:

Count Pulaski, of Poland, an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of liberties of his country against the three great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, will have the honor of delivering this note to your excellency's hands.

Pulaski landed at Marblehead on July 23, 1777. When Pulaski first met Washington the fortunes of the colonists were at a low ebb. New York had been lost the previous year; a series of defeats, desertions, and lapsing of enlistments had reduced Washington's forces to a pitiful ragged handful to oppose Lord Howe's army of 30,000 thoroughly equipped and well-supplied soldiers.

Washington sent a letter introducing Count Pulaski to the Continental Congress, urging that he be given a commission. Delays held up congressional action, which did not at all suit the dashing Polish officer. Washington's army had gone to meet the enemy, so Pulaski went also, although having no official standing. Washington wrote Hancock, introducing Pulaski's plan for a mounted corps. Two weeks later, before the letter could be considered by Congress, Count Pulaski received his American baptism of fire at the Battle of Brandywine, although holding no command or commission.

Howe, at the head of 20,000 troops, was marching to capture Philadelphia. Washington drew his poorly equipped and poorly trained men, numbering half as many, across the British advance. Howe and Cornwallis flanked the Continental Army, routing one wing, and forced Washington to retreat. The absence of a mounted force had left Washington in the dark so far as reliable and prompt information of British movements was concerned. In this engagement, at a critical time, Washington gave Pulaski command of his own body guard and 30 horse. Although this was a pitifully inadequate weapon, with his small detachment Pulaski charged the oncoming British, retarded their advance, and checkmated an effort to cut off the American avenue of retreat and capture the American baggage. Four days after this Congress named Pulaski "commander of the horse, with the rank of brigadier." In short, this dashing young Polish fighter was the first American Chief of Cavalry.

Five days after the Battle of Brandywine, on September 16, 1777, Pulaski saved the army of Washington from a surprise attack that might have proven disastrous. Reconnoitering with his cavalry, he found a British army near Warren Tavern. Hastily apprising Washington of the situation, he harassed the enemy, impeding their progress sufficiently to give Washington time to complete his preparations for battle.

Pulaski saw little of the terrible winter at Valley Forge. The last day of 1777 he was ordered to Trenton to establish a camp to instruct and condition the soldiers for the next campaign. The latter part of February of the next year Pulaski with 50 men joined Gen. Anthony Wayne, who had 250 New Jersey militiamen. The combined forces, small though they were in numbers, were ordered to thwart an attack by which the British planned to secure supplies from Philadelphia. On March 3, 1778, the British were met at Haddonfield, N. J. In this encounter Pulaski's horse was shot dead under him and he personally took seven prisoners. General Wayne, reporting the battle, said that "Pulaski behaved with his usual bravery."

Pulaski was dissatisfied with the condition of the cavalry he commanded and also with the inadequate attention given

his pleas for reorganization and strengthening of this arm of the service. As he also felt the lack of cooperation on the part of some of his officers who objected to a leader relatively unacquainted with English, Pulaski resigned his command in March, 1778. He then requested Washington and the Continental Congress to permit him to organize an independent force, which became famous later as the "Pulaski Legion." To the credit of the Continental Congress, it adopted a resolution retaining for Count Pulaski his rank of brigadier general and giving him the permission he desired.

The next month Pulaski opened a recruiting office in Baltimore and by July of 1778 had raised, organized, and disciplined an independent corps made up of three companies of cavalry and three of infantry. The officers were chiefly Polish and French. Pulaski's legion served as the model upon which General Lee's independent legions were organized in the following century during the Civil War. The famous banner made for his legion by the Moravian nuns is still preserved by the Maryland Historical Society of Baltimore.

Far from seeking to enhance his own fortunes at the expense of the struggling colonists, Pulaski spent a great deal of his own money in raising and equipping his own legion. Addressing Congress in September, 1778, he said he had expended at least \$16,000 of his own money. This was only a few months after the independent corps began its existence. Later Captain Baldesquin, paymaster of the legion, told Congress Pulaski had spent for it at least \$50,000 of his own money. In the fall of 1778 the legion took the field, its first operations being at Egg Harbor, N. J., to protect a privateer base. The infantry portion of the legion was surprised there by the British on October 15, and Lieut. Col. Baron DeBose, a Pole, was slain. Pulaski's cavalry rescued the infantry and drove back the invaders.

After further service in Minisink region in New Jersey, Pulaski, with part of his force moved south, reaching Charleston, S. C., on May 8. Three days later the remainder of the legion arrived. The same day a British force under General Provost crossed the Ashley River with 900 men and was sharply attacked by Pulaski's men. This engagement was of little importance except for the fact that this prompt and bold attack greatly raised the spirits of the people and inspired the inexperienced troops then in the city with confidence.

When the governor and council of Charleston were ready to surrender the city to the British, Pulaski, seconded by General Moultrie and Colonel Laurens, persuaded them to reject the plan and that same night General Provost retreated across the river, having learned that General Lincoln was marching toward Charleston with a force of 4,000 men.

Savannah was a British stronghold and General Lincoln intended to besiege it. Count Pulaski and General McIntosh preceded the main army to attack and harass British outposts. The siege of Savannah started September 16, with Count d'Estaing with a French fleet aiding the siege from the sea. The French commander finally requested that the city be attacked by storm, to which plan General Lincoln consented after some hesitation. Accordingly, on October 9 the order went forth that the British ramparts were to be stormed. The cavalry of the French and the Americans was commanded by Pulaski. He was to charge the embattlements and the infantry were ordered to storm the right of the British line.

The well-laid plans went wrong, due to the treachery of an American soldier who deserted after the orders were announced. Consequently enemy troops were massed at point of attack and deadly fire repulsed the assailants. Count d'Estaing tried to advance directly across a swamp, but a deadly cross fire wrought havoc among his men. Seeing the confusion and knowing that something had gone wrong with the plans, Pulaski, at the head of his cavalry, dashed to reinforce and encourage the French, at the same time hoping to find an opening through which he could slip to the rear of the British. Riding through a withering flame of enemy shells he was struck in the groin and fell to the ground mortally wounded.

The heroic Polish commander was carried away by his own soldiers, placed on the American brig *Wasp* under the care of skilled French surgeons. However, gangrene had set in and two days later, on October 11, 1779, he was buried at sea. When the *Wasp* sailed into Charleston Harbor with her flag at half mast and it became known that the gallant Pulaski was dead, the city went into general mourning. High honors were paid to the memory of the dashing cavalier by the city, the State, and the Continental Congress.

Thus ended, at the age of 31 years, the career of a gallant soldier who had made himself a heroic figure both in America and in Europe.

On the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the siege of Savannah, October 9-11, 1929, nation-wide tribute was paid to the memory of this fighter for freedom. President Hoover and the Congress of the United States designated a committee to head the national observance of the anniversary of Pulaski's death, and cities and States from coast to coast united in paying the highest honors to the memory of this distinguished Pole who laid down his life in the cause of the American independence led by George Washington.

Statues of Count Casimir Pulaski and General Kosciuszko are located in the city of Washington as follows:

Count Pulaski in Franklin Park at the intersection of E Street and Pennsylvania Avenue.

General Kosciuszko in the east corner of Lafayette Square. Erected by the Polish National Alliance of America and presented on behalf of the Polish American citizens May 11, 1910.

Busts of both are also located in Statuary Hall in the Capitol in Washington.

CORRECTION IN CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, in publishing the last directory unwittingly an injustice was done the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA]. We have listed the gentleman from New York as coming from Brooklyn, and I understand the gentleman objects to that and says he is a citizen of New York. It was an error committed in the office, and we very gladly apologize for it and ask that all Members address the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] in New York and not in Brooklyn.

INVESTIGATION OF CAUSE AND EFFECT OF DEPRESSED VALUE OF SILVER, MONETARY POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES, ETC.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up the resolution (H. Res. 72) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama calls up a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 72

Resolved, That the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures is authorized and directed, as a whole or by subcommittee, to investigate the cause and effect of the present depressed value of silver, the monetary policies of the United States and foreign countries and their relation to the value of silver, methods of stabilizing the value of silver, and the advisability of an international conference to consider methods by which by international cooperation the value of silver can be stabilized. Such committee shall report its findings to the House, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman from Indiana desire some time under the rule?

Mr. PURNELL. I have some requests. I would like the gentleman to yield me 30 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have given assurance to the Speaker that we would limit time as much as possible on this rule. Could the gentleman not get along with 20 minutes? I hope the gentleman can do so.

Mr. PURNELL. I would be glad to get along with 15 minutes if the gentleman will help me.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will be glad to do that. I will make that agreement with the gentleman, that we will each use 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes, or so much thereof as he may desire, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS], chairman of the committee.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. House Resolution 72 directs the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to investigate the cause and effect of the present depressed value of silver, the monetary policies of the United States and foreign countries, and their relation to the value of silver, methods of stabilizing the value of silver, and the advisability of an international conference to consider methods by which, by international cooperation, the value of silver can be stabilized.

As a preface to anything which your committee may state or recommend, they desire to go on record as recognizing and adhering to the principle that no monetary system can endure which has not stood the test of time nor the sanction of the customs of the people whom it serves.

The gold standard has served the people of the United States from the late seventies upon the resumption of the specie payments by our Treasury up to the present time. Until quite recently it performed similar service for all the nations of the western world and may, therefore, be said to have merited the sanction which only custom could give it. Having accepted this principle, the committee conclude that their efforts should be entirely directed toward finding a solution for their problem which shall preserve for the people of the United States the integrity of the gold standard because that system seems best suited to their habits and to their customs.

The committee believe that the foregoing principle of reasoning if applicable to the American monetary system in its relation to the people of this country can, in all propriety, and should, in all fairness, be applied to other monetary systems of the world in their relations to the habits and customs of the citizens of these other nations.

The price of silver, or of any other commodity, responds to the natural law of supply and demand with the distinction that, unlike any other commodity excepting gold, silver serves a dual purpose in that it is both a commodity and a yardstick of value, and, while not our yardstick, certainly that of untold millions of human beings in many parts of the world who are the direct or indirect customers of the people of the United States of America. It is the task of the committee to determine the causes of the fall in the price of silver in the face of the reduced production, as well as to inquire into the rise in the price of gold, when measured in terms of all commodities, including labor. This rise has come about despite the substantial production and the continuous increase of visible stocks. After having ascertained the foregoing, the committee will endeavor to analyze the effects of these paradoxical phenomena upon the monetary systems of the world, and, through these, their influence upon the trade of the world. Once causes and effects are known and the accurate diagnosis established, it is the committee's conviction that the remedy will logically suggest itself.

History shows that the monetary policy of any country, of the United States as well as of foreign countries, is subject to alteration, voluntary or otherwise, in accordance with changed economic conditions. While the committee can not recommend that suggestions be advanced to other nations which would effectually alter their monetary policies to suit our convenience, they nevertheless feel that other nations can be approached in all propriety with such suggestions as are based on the broader aspect of the situation if examination reveals the nature of our problems as being identical with their own.

After analysis of the subject the committee will make such recommendations as they deem advisable, bearing in mind the international aspects of the question, because gold and silver are recognized the world over as yardsticks of value, stores of wealth, and those instruments which are utilized

for the discharge of international obligations, either when credit is unnecessary or when it fails for the purpose, or when the machinery of credit is nonexistent as is the case in certain parts of the world. Such conditions, if existent, are a challenge to international cooperation, so that if the examination reveals them, the committee will most certainly recommend the shortest path to cooperation by conference or otherwise.

The committee further believes that the solution of the fundamental problem of money is at the very root of our present evils, so that its correction necessarily implies progress in the solving of other important questions, the discussion of which in the absence of stable monetary conditions becomes futile and academic. As a matter of fact, the committee points out that it may be understood both at home and abroad that if monetary instability has destroyed trade, and with it capacity to pay, it has also destroyed in the same degree our ability to cancel. It therefore follows, as naturally as day follows night, that stability of money should restore trade, thus re-creating capacity to pay and likewise our ability to cancel. Under such conditions the common burden might possibly be borne by all, because cooperative effort will have made it lighter, whereas, under present conditions, it is too heavy to be carried alone, so that danger threatens creditor and debtor nations alike.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We observe from a reading of the last paragraph of the resolution that there is no limitation or suggestion of limitation placed upon the amount that the committee will ask under this appropriation. The gentleman from New York in presenting this rule to the Committee on Rules, gave us the assurance, the most modest one I have ever heard, where an investigation was asked, that they would not ask for more than \$5,000 total to be used in this investigation. I would like to have the gentleman from New York confirm that statement.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. It is my belief that no more than \$5,000 will be necessary for this investigation, and it is my intention to ask for no more.

Mr. PURNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I yield.

Mr. PURNELL. I wanted to confirm what the gentleman from Alabama said, and also express the hope that this resolution may be amended so as to provide that. I realize the gentleman has made the statement before the committee in utmost good faith, but the gentleman must recognize that these things often get away from even the chairman and the minority and the majority members of the committee.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I realize that, and I have no objection whatever to amending the resolution at the present time to limit it to that amount.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I yield.

Mr. UNDERHILL. It was along that line that I wished to propound an inquiry to the gentleman having the bill in charge. I realize the futility of opposing such measures as this. If they are to be opposed, they should be opposed at the present time, but there is never anyone ready to take the floor in opposition to them. I certainly should feel it a part of my duty to oppose the resolution unless a specific amount were stated and the House was allowed to understand and know in the first place just how much it would cost. Of course, in the past it has been shown that these investigations lead to nothing and accomplish little or nothing, but that has no effect upon the Members of Congress. I do think that before this resolution is passed, we should have definitely stated the amount they intend to ask and the amount which would be the limit, so that they will not come in later for an additional amount. If nobody else offers the amendment, I will offer an amendment that this be limited to \$5,000.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I yield.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] is doing a good service as the watchdog of the Treasury. The gentleman states that these investigations

amount to nothing and reach nowhere. I would inform the gentleman that we have had very few investigations in the House of Representatives. Every investigation ought to be conducted by the House of Representatives instead of by the other body. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that while other investigations may have come to naught, as the gentleman says, yet the gentleman has never witnessed an investigation by such a committee as we have now in charge of coinage, weights, and measures. [Applause.] I regard the chairman of this committee as the best-posted man with whom I have had any conversation on the subject of silver. [Applause.] I am not going to be a member of this investigating committee, so I may speak unselfishly. I hope the expense will not be limited. This is the most important problem before the American people to-day in the direction of curing the ills of our own governmental financial system.

I hope the committee will be given wide leverage and plenty of money to secure an investigation which will mean something. [Applause.]

Mr. SOMERS of New York. May I say to the gentleman from Nebraska that that compliment, coming from him, is one that is going to linger long in my memory. I can not conceive of a finer tribute paid to any man. I wish I deserved it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EATON]. [Applause.]

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to add thereto a circulation statement of United States money, December 31, 1931.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, once more I want to talk to you about silver. This time in support of H. Res. 72, which I trust will pass without a dissenting vote.

Since I spoke the first time in this Seventy-second Congress on the subject of silver it seems as if all the old stories, the old prejudices, and the old arguments have been revived. Just yesterday I was reminded of that old story of the gold monometallist who, looking at a silver dollar, said to the bimetalist, "It's good you have those words on there, 'In God we trust.' Would that you might also have engraven these words on all coins so that it could be believed by all, 'I know that my Redeemer liveth.'"

And that little note of confidence is what is being shown here this morning, at least to the extent of authorizing the Coins, Weights, and Measures Committee to investigate the cause and effect of:

First. The present depressed price of silver.

Second. The monetary policies of the United States and foreign countries and their relation to the value of silver.

Third. Methods of stabilizing the value of silver; and

Fourth. Advisability of an international conference to consider methods by which international cooperation, the value of silver, can be stabilized.

Just as an indication of what that committee has before it, let me mention to you some of the remedies which have been suggested during the month of January, 1932. I do not mean that any one of these was first suggested in that month, but each one of those I mention, and others, has been discussed in my hearing since Christmas.

CHECKS

When that committee delves into the monetary policies of the United States, it will have to consider the effect of the checking system of this country which is so universally used to make available our bank deposits. Statistics may be seen which demonstrate that during the peak year of 1929 the bank deposits of New York City turned over every other day—more than 160 times during the year. Throughout the whole United States the bank deposits of the cities of the United States turned over during 1930 oftener than once a week, and for the time in 1931 for which figures are available, the turnover was only 10 per cent less.

The figures of our money turnover are stupendous. A few days ago the Ways and Means Committee were told that the annual manufacturing business of the United States amounted to \$60,000,000,000, and the speaker attempted to demonstrate how a very small tax rate on that amount would produce a large revenue. A statistician tells us that the annual check turnover of money was eleven times greater than the money produced from business in 1930. He says: "In 1930 over six hundred and sixty-two billions of money duty was obtained from the use of checks."

What change has the checking system made in the monetary system of the United States since the demonitization of silver?

A LIMITED COINAGE OF SILVER AT A FLEXIBLE RATIO OF SILVER TO GOLD

A limited coinage of silver at a flexible ratio of silver to gold is one plan. This means a present adjustment of the existing stocks of silver to gold, the proportion to be designated, and thereafter silver and gold to be augmented in an adjustable quantity to maintain the proportion of weight of metal and value thereof.

When it is pointed out that the proportion of production of gold and silver since Columbus discovered the New World is about 13½ to 1 in weight, that the proportion of gold and silver actually used in our own money system is said to be about 5 to 1 in dollars, and that the present annual production is approximately 10 to 1 by weight, the difficulty of starting a properly adjusted basis is at once apparent.

However, one of these plans is premised upon a general principle that our currency should rest upon a 50 per cent metal base; that is, that the total paper money should not be more than double the amount of metal, and that the metal basis should be double—that is, bimetallic—gold and silver. Of this bimetallic base there should be a constant of one-half gold, the other half to be a variable of gold and silver, containing a minimum of one-fourth of the half, or one-eighth, and the balance of three-fourths of the half, or three-eighths, optionally, gold and silver in any proportion.

If silver is not on a fixed ratio of weight to gold, but is figured at its market value for defined periods, measured by the gold standard, the number of ounces of silver required to balance the currency would rise and fall automatically, adjusting the market price of silver and the quantity in the currency, thus, it is said, making an automatic peg of the price of silver.

On the basis of the December 31, 1931, circulation of United States money, would not this plan work out in this way?

We had on hand \$4,460,099,079 in gold and \$848,271,510 in silver bullion, coined dollars, and subsidiary silver coins. The proportion proposed would require \$281,778,030 more silver to bring it up to one-fourth of the gold, or \$1,130,049,540. I am talking now about dollars, not ounces of gold or silver, because the circulation statement mentions only dollars for gold, silver, and paper money. This additional silver is, in round figures, \$300,000,000. I have not learned whether the proponents of this plan have considered the statement which I made to you in this House last month that there were \$308,628,269 in silver dollars and \$268,063,510.80 in subsidiary silver coins unaccounted for in our circulation. It may be merely a coincidence, but it is worthy of careful study to determine whether the currency of this country ought not to be balanced by purchasing approximately \$300,000,000 in silver, and to decide whether that figure ought to designate ounces of silver on the present buying power of gold converted into silver at the prevailing market price; or coin the silver into dollars or to hold the bullion and merely issue paper certificates therefor.

Our total circulation of all kinds of money—gold, silver, minor coins, and paper—amounted to \$9,421,224,505. On the proposed basis we would be entitled to have a total currency of \$10,616,741,198 upon our present holding of the metals—gold and silver. This is \$1,195,516,693 more than is now in circulation. But if it is wise to keep the paper money down to its proportion of 40 per cent of the total currency, will you agree that the economic structure will

remain sound if we increase our metal base by putting into it the silver to balance this theory? If you answer "yes," then you may increase our currency with the minimum amount of inflation, and it is an open question whether it would amount to any more inflation than there is in our

currency at the present time when compared with its metal foundation.

Here is the "Circulation Statement of United States Money," as issued by the Treasury Department as of date, December 31, 1931:

Circulation statement of United States money, December 31, 1931

Kind of money	Total amount	Money held in the Treasury					Money outside of the Treasury				Population of continental United States (estimated)
		Total	Amount held in trust against gold and silver certificates (and Treasury notes of 1890)	Reserve against United States notes (and Treasury notes of 1890)	Held for Federal reserve banks and agents	All other money	Total	Held by Federal reserve banks and agents ¹	In circulation ²		
									Amount	Per capita	
Gold coin and bullion.....	³ \$4,460,099,079	\$3,557,702,389	\$1,751,456,019	\$156,039,083	\$81,564,818,834	\$85,388,448	\$902,396,690	\$493,770,233	\$408,626,457	\$3.28	
Gold certificates.....	⁴ (1,751,456,109)						1,751,456,019	874,686,980	876,769,039	7.04	
Standard silver dollars.....	539,958,135	498,896,665	495,471,960			3,394,699	41,091,470	8,297,281	32,794,189	.27	
Silver certificates.....	⁴ (494,241,766)						494,241,766	105,153,789	289,087,977	3.13	
Treasury notes of 1890.....	⁴ (1,230,200)						1,230,200		1,230,200	.01	
Subsidiary silver.....	308,313,375	7,401,417				7,401,417	300,911,958	30,320,809	270,591,149	2.17	
Minor coin.....	126,659,014	4,331,189				4,331,189	122,327,828	5,160,395	117,167,433	.94	
United States notes.....	346,681,016	3,549,883				3,549,883	243,131,133	55,320,287	287,810,846	2.31	
Federal reserve notes.....	2,926,038,690	959,175				959,175	2,925,079,515	321,625,858	2,603,453,657	20.90	
Federal reserve bank notes.....	2,863,300	25,121				25,121	2,838,179	100	2,838,079	.02	
National bank notes.....	710,611,896	17,078,579				17,078,579	693,533,317	37,129,455	656,403,862	5.27	
Total, Dec. 31, 1931.....	9,421,224,505	\$4,080,914,415	2,246,927,985	156,039,083	81,564,818,834	\$122,128,508	7,578,238,075	1,931,465,187	5,645,772,888	45.34	124,556,000
Comparative totals:											
Nov. 30, 1931.....	9,214,178,615	\$3,970,010,745	2,268,735,369	156,039,083	1,404,877,582	140,358,709	7,512,903,236	1,976,760,559	5,536,142,677	44.48	124,476,000
Dec. 31, 1930.....	8,713,875,325	\$4,053,167,745	2,280,859,060	156,039,083	1,526,868,978	89,400,620	6,941,566,639	2,051,443,291	4,890,123,348	39.41	124,074,000
Oct. 31, 1920.....	8,479,620,824	\$2,436,864,530	718,674,378	152,979,023	1,212,360,791	352,850,356	6,761,430,672	1,063,216,060	5,698,214,612	53.21	107,096,005
Mar. 31, 1917.....	5,396,596,677	\$2,952,020,313	2,681,691,072	152,979,023		117,350,216	5,126,267,436	953,321,522	4,172,945,914	40.23	103,716,000
June 30, 1914.....	3,797,825,099	\$1,845,569,804	1,507,178,879	150,000,000		188,390,925	3,450,434,174		3,450,434,174	34.93	99,027,000
Jan. 1, 1879.....	1,007,084,483	\$212,420,402	21,602,640	100,000,000		90,817,762	816,266,721		816,266,721	16.92	48,231,000

¹ Includes money held by the Cuban agency of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

² The money in circulation includes any paper currency held outside the continental limits of the United States.

³ Does not include gold bullion or foreign coin other than that held by the Treasury, Federal reserve banks, and Federal reserve agents. Gold held by Federal reserve banks under earmark for foreign account is excluded, and gold held abroad for Federal reserve banks is included.

⁴ These amounts are not included in the total, since the money held in trust against gold and silver certificates and Treasury notes of 1890 is included under gold coin and bullion and standard silver dollars, respectively.

⁵ The amount of money held in trust against gold and silver certificates and Treasury notes of 1890 should be deducted from this total before combining it with total money outside of the Treasury to arrive at the stock of money in the United States.

⁶ This total includes \$55,456,536 gold deposited for the redemption of Federal reserve notes (\$503,280 in process of redemption), \$28,667,622 lawful money deposited for the redemption of national bank notes (\$17,040,235 in process of redemption, including notes chargeable to the retirement fund), \$1,350 lawful money deposited for the retirement of additional circulation (act of May 30, 1908), and \$16,155,207 lawful money deposited as a reserve for postal-savings deposits.

NOTE.—Gold certificates are secured, dollar for dollar, by gold held in the Treasury for their redemption; silver certificates are secured, dollar for dollar, by standard silver dollars held in the Treasury for their redemption; United States notes are secured by a gold reserve of \$156,039,083 held in the Treasury. This reserve fund may also be used for the redemption of Treasury notes of 1890, which are also secured, dollar for dollar, by standard silver dollars held in the Treasury; these notes are being canceled and retired on receipt. Federal reserve notes are obligations of the United States and a first lien on all the assets of the issuing Federal reserve bank. Federal reserve notes are secured by the deposit with Federal reserve agents of a like amount of gold or gold and such discounted or purchased paper as is eligible under the terms of the Federal reserve act. Federal reserve banks must maintain a gold reserve of at least 40 per cent, including the gold redemption fund which must be deposited with the United States Treasurer against Federal reserve notes in actual circulation. Lawful money has been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for retirement of all outstanding Federal reserve bank notes. National bank notes are secured by United States bonds except where lawful money has been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for their retirement. A 5 per cent fund is also maintained in lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States for the redemption of national bank notes secured by Government bonds.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. If the foregoing sounds involved, I will not take the time this moment to straighten it out. Suffice it to say that there is also required in this plan that withdrawal of gold shall be protected, and to that end each dollar of paper currency should be redeemable in the stated proportions of gold and silver in the metal reserve at the time of redemption.

NEW COINS WITH A DIFFERENT STATUS THAN THE PRESENT ISSUE

New coins, with a different status than the present issued, are an adaptation of an Englishman's idea of new international interchangeable silver money and are the subject of a pending bill. It provides for the handling of silver at the mint and the issuance therefor of silver certificates payable in ounces of silver instead of dollars.

A variation of this idea is proposed by one who suggests a half-billion-dollar international corporation, which will be vested with the power of buying silver, issuing paper certificates therefor, having an interchangeable value between the countries interested, just like travelers' checks. This would involve the designation of a place of deposit of the silver which would be satisfactory to all nations concerned.

CHANGING VALUE OF GOLD PLAN

Changing value of gold plan is the subject of a pending bill which proposes to change the present standard in weight of the gold dollar, which to-day is 23.22 grains, pure gold, by reducing it approximately one-fourth, thus making the standard gold dollar approximately 17.42 grains of the same fineness.

It is apparent that the immediate effect of such a proposal would be to immediately inflate the value of the existing gold approximately one-third, so that the existing gold in the Treasury, measured by such a new basis, instead of being four billion and odd dollars, would be six billion and odd dollars.

This bill further provides for regulation of the weight of the gold dollar by the gage of its average buying power and a plan for determining the same.

FREE COINAGE OF SILVER AT A RATIO OF 16 TO 1

Free coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1, means silver as a legal tender for all purposes and interchangeable with gold at the ratio. The bankers, international and otherwise, resist this idea. They own and hold the obligations payable in gold. The representatives of two nation-wide farmers' organizations unequivocally support the idea and point out that if the elements of economics as stated by the bankers are true, than neither farming nor any other industry of the world can pay itself out of its present debts. Bankruptcy, general in character, will have to be invoked to settle the private debts. Repudiation and the disagreeable features incident to such action will have to be used by nations to dispose of the international as well as the internal public debts.

They point out that the price of silver follows or accompanies the prices of commodities up and down.

The inadequacy of the amount of existing gold for money purposes is accentuated.

The continual annual decline of adequate gold production is a fact which is predicted to continue.

The necessity for now retracing the steps taken in 1873 and 1893 and making a solid bimetallic base for our money at a definite ratio of 16 to 1 in place of the present inadequate gold base is fully believed and supported by these farmers' organizations, by miners, and a host of others, organized and unorganized—and they are not confined to the United States.

CHANGING LEGAL-TENDER PLAN

Changing legal-tender plan is the subject of one pending bill which provides that hereafter all debts shall be payable in lawful money of the United States and not in any specified weight of gold, and declaring unlawful and void any contract or agreement hereafter made specifying the weight and fineness of gold in which it shall be paid.

A variation of this plan is retroactive in effect and provides that silver shall have unlimited monetary privileges in all transactions for which settlements were previously made or required to be made in gold. In this suggestion it is proposed that the ratio of silver to gold shall be immediately set at 1 to 50, to continue for the first five years. To-day's ratio in value is approximately 1 to 70, I believe.

For the next succeeding 20 years the ratio shall be gradually reduced until it reaches 25 to 1, or possibly 20 to 1. It is suggested that this plan be concurred in by the principal silver-producing countries—United States, Canada, Mexico, and Peru—and if so agreed, that this would automatically establish a value for the world which would prevail as the proportion diminished.

It is pointed out in connection with this plan that, while much is said about obligations payable in gold of the standard weight and fineness, outside of governmental debts and many corporate bond issues, many, if not most, debts now in existence in the United States have no such specific contractual obligation. It is significant that when we were informed by the press of the country upon September 21, 1931, that England had gone off the gold standard the truth was that England excepted from its edict certain governmental and other obligations which specifically required payment in gold of a certain weight and fineness, and applied the edict to all others, thus classifying the debts incurred without special reference to gold as being payable according to the new rule.

UNLIMITED POWER OF PURCHASE AND STORAGE INSTEAD OF UNLIMITED PURCHASE AND COINAGE

Unlimited power of purchase and storage instead of unlimited purchase and coinage is a plan providing that paper certificates shall be issued against the silver in storage without requiring that any part of it be stamped out of the silver bars as coins.

This variation of the free and unlimited coinage of silver has its serious advocates who insist that this is the remedy which must finally be adopted, and until it is that there will continue to be financial disturbances as long as this country recognizes any metallic base for its money system. I believe it is called by some the "silver asset" plan.

THE WAR-DEBT PAYMENT PLAN

Another proposal is that the war debt of the United States be paid in silver. It involves many questions besides the simple one of payment. Where would the paying nations get the silver? How much money is involved? How much silver?

We now use nearly a billion dollars in designated silver in our currency, either as coins or in paper dollars. There are over \$10,000,000,000 to be paid. The annual payment covered by the moratorium is about a quarter of a billion dollars.

If we took payment in silver, what would we do with it?

MORE USES FOR SILVER

Some advocate finding more uses for silver for commercial purposes. Some the use of more silver dollars. One proposal is to reduce the size of both the silver dollar and half dollars in an attempt to popularize their use. Another proposal is to make new coins of part silver and part gold.

There was a proposal that the United States buy 200,000,000 ounces of silver bullion and lend it to the Chinese Government.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

It is said that by international conference the Indian rupee may be restored to a pre-war basis; Great Britain, France, and Mexico may restore the fineness of silver coins to the pre-war basis; all countries off the gold standard may increase their circulation by new silver coinage—and the continued menace of the sale of silver surplus by India may be removed.

Further, that the production of silver may be restricted by agreement between the silver-producing countries—United States, Canada, Mexico, and Peru.

CONCLUSION

In mentioning these suggestions I do not want anyone to feel abused because I have not spoken of his pet theory. There is not time.

But it is significant that in the explanation of every scheme it appears that the use of silver as money in the United States has practically ceased except for subsidiary money and as a reserve for the issuance of paper dollar bills.

Some say this is not a money panic. I am told that if it were necessary the Federal reserve bank could properly issue \$3,000,000,000 more of Federal reserve notes; that it has on hand enough gold and eligible paper to increase the paper money of the country \$3,000,000,000. There are some who say that it is not metal or paper currency which the country needs in this financial crisis. Others unreservedly and without hesitation state that it is necessary to inflate our currency at the present time.

To increase the circulating medium owned and issued by the Government and to inflate the currency do not mean the same thing to me, but it is certainly true that bankers, publicists, business men, economists, farmers, and all classes are concerned with the question of balancing the purchasing power of the currency we are using. And they and every one of us know that we are in the same shape as the bank whose customers start a run. If called upon for payment, the bank can only pay a part of its entire deposits. If all payments upon delinquent debts required to be made in gold were called, there is not enough gold to make them.

And whether the condition resulting will be a general bankruptcy or whether it results in inflation of currency or repudiation of debts, the net results will be the same. As the adjustments are made, at least a part of the losses caused by the changed buying power of commodities, as well as silver, must be borne by the money lenders and those to whom they have passed on the loans.

The more I hear the subject discussed the more am I coming to believe that the way out is to increase our currency by adding more silver in the base; but whether this is done by the purchase of silver with gold, on a 16-to-1 or some other basis, or the issuance of silver certificates or the required use of silver dollars as a working part of our currency, or a moratorium on payments in gold as was ordered by England, is a conclusion I have reserved until those who have also studied the question present their views at the hearings provided for by the resolution.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ARENTZ].

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from Nevada, Senator KEY PITTMAN, last year introduced a resolution calling for an international conference. Since that time both Senator PITTMAN, Senator ODDIE, and myself have been pushing such an idea. If an international conference is called and our delegates go abroad without a plan or without any suggestion from the Congress of the United States, what will they do? They are going to be dealt with in the same manner that every American conference that has gone abroad has been treated. They are going to be jockeyed around by the foreign delegates, and either something done to satisfy those countries or nothing will be done. I am sure if a plan for the stabilization of silver satisfactory to the Congress of the United States is ultimately adopted it is reasonable to suppose we would be more apt to reach that consummation if our delegates have some plan to propose.

Now, what does this resolution do? This resolution provides for a thorough investigation of all phases of the silver question. To us men here in contact with our constituents, every day we are receiving word to the effect that commodity prices are low; that commodity prices are such that they can not pay their debts. Where a dollar represented a bushel of wheat or even less than that a few years ago, to-day it represents 2 or 3 bushels, so that the farmer, instead of paying his debts under conditions such as exist to-day, desires something to be done about the stabilization of commodity prices. The same statement holds true of the mine operator, the lumberman, the sheepman, the cattleman, and the manufacturer.

It is rather remarkable and significant, in looking back over the history of our monetary conferences both here and abroad, that they have always occurred when commodity prices were low, and I may say for the benefit of the membership of this House that everything that has been done to silver in the past 125 or 130 years has been artificially accomplished. In other words, it has been accomplished by the legislatures or by edict of some foreign country or by legislation of our Congress. It has not been the result of any natural condition. In each case silver has received its deathblow little by little for the last 130 years because of the avarice of men who control gold, without any thought for the man who works in the field or in the factory. They were interested in the monetary questions solely on the basis of how it would benefit them without regard as to how adversely it would affect the rest of the world.

Oh, I wish I had the time to read to you extracts from Government records that I have picked up here, there, and everywhere, dealing with the viewpoint of the banker with regard to the way he looks on gold, his control of same, and through such control the economic enslavement of the masses. I can not interpret England's policy in India, adopted in 1926, as meaning anything else than this. The subject of silver touches the whole world; its depreciation has thrown the world into chaos.

But all this aside, what we are interested in is stability of commodity prices, and it is my firm conviction you can not have stability of commodity prices unless you do something with respect to international money. We have half the world using silver and half the world using gold, with most of this one-half at the present time off the gold standard. We know there are 800,000,000 people in the world who use silver. We know that added to this number at the present time are all those nations that are off the gold standard.

Now, is it not within our right, is it not a sensible thing, to investigate silver to determine whether or not we can reach an agreement with the nations of the world to agree upon an international viewpoint regarding silver? I think it is. I think we can accomplish this; and if we can accomplish this through this hearing that is to be held on all phases of the silver question it will be worth to the world a thousand thousand times what this investigation will cost. If it results in something tangible being accomplished and that something is placed in the hands of our delegates, if we do call an international conference, then we can go abroad and accomplish some good.

I may say that if I had the power to-day I would not only direct, I would force, the President of the United States to call an international conference, because I think it is one of the most important things before the American people to-day. [Applause.] When this investigation is completed I feel sure that a plan will be proposed meeting the approval of not only the Congress but of our President. When this happy day arrives we will have made the most important step toward the prevention of great depression through which we are now passing and the early resumption of normal international trade and resulting world-wide prosperity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, of all times this is the most inopportune for the advocates of bimetalism to revive the issues of the campaign of 1896.

When Great Britain suspended payments in gold it was necessary for our Government representatives abroad to give assurance to the world that we were not going off of the gold basis.

Gold monometallism as the standard has not failed. This is but an endeavor of the silver-mining States to sell something that has no value whatsoever or to increase the intrinsic value. It is a revival of the old campaign of the Boy Orator from the Platte to try a panacea for depressed prices and to give value to something that has no value.

With 499,000,000 of silver dollars coined, 489,000,000 are represented by silver certificates that are in circulation, and these certificates other than the fractional depreciated value of the silver dollar, about 20 cents, have nothing back of them than the promise of the Government.

The value to-day of silver is on a ratio, not of 16 to 1, as the silver-tongued orator of the Platte attempted to have this country adopt, but of about 30 to 1. We went through that issue and the country decided that gold should be the standard. With the United States having vast quantities of gold and it having been proved in these times of depression that the gold standard has not failed, I say to attempt to do something by legislation now, in these delicate financial times, to cause fear and suspicion that the great United States is going off the gold standard is most ill-advised, and I shall vote against the resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON].

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, coming from one of the largest silver-producing States in the Union, let me say in reply to the gentleman from Wisconsin that there is no request or desire on the part of the people interested in silver to revive the old bimetallic issue of 16 to 1. While we do deeply appreciate the very splendid service the gentleman from New York is rendering in asking for an investigation, the movement is not primarily a silver one. The movement is born of a desire to help the world, and this country in particular.

It came, and is coming, as the result of a careful study on the part of men who are trying to work out some sensible solution of the economic situation that confronts the world to-day.

If you go back over the history of this country, you will find that after all the main thing that has brought the country out of the economic depressions of the past has been the discovery of gold in new fields, thereby replenishing the supply of money. The added supply of money has always aided restoring prosperity.

I venture the prediction that there will be no permanent solution of this problem until we have a more sound and a more elastic monetary system in the United States. It may be that again somewhere we shall find more gold, although all lands of the world have been pretty well prospected. We find ourselves with constantly increasing business, constantly increasing and expanding commerce, with a very limited supply of basic money as a medium of exchange. It does not take an economist to see that something is wrong.

We have something like eleven billions of gold in the world to carry on the business of the entire world. It is entirely insufficient. A supplemental supply of basic money must be found. The reserves must be decreased or supplemented by some money in addition to the gold.

We know that our business has fallen off in these United States. I believe there is a direct relationship in the decline of silver and the reduction in commerce. How is it that from China the other day an order was sent over here for a \$50 typewriter and it was found on investigation that the person who ordered it would have to pay \$200 on the basis of the price of silver? The price of silver then was about 26 cents an ounce. There must be some relation—there is some relation between the silver supply and the use of money—gold and silver—and this entire economic situation. We should make a careful investigation of what that relationship is. I am sure we shall find that when silver prices are low commodity prices are low.

For one, coming from a silver-producing State, I want to again voice my appreciation for the work of the men who are willing to take up and give this subject careful study and investigation. I predict great good will come from this movement. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the House will consider and pass this resolution for this investigation. I regret that my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] attempted to discuss it from the standpoint of politics, because certainly there is no politics in this resolution for investigation.

There will be legislation at some future time, either in this or the next Congress, considered to give silver a place in our monetary system.

The international system is very complicated. Many nations formerly on single gold standard have drifted away from that.

Great debtor nations of the United States are on a silver basis. Nations to which we export figure their values in silver, and it makes it very complicated from the standpoint of an exporter and complicates the collection of debts owing us by nations abroad.

An editorial in the Star of yesterday was headed "A Billion and a Half of Dollars Is in Hoarding." The per capita circulation in the United States in normal times is none too large. At this time we have reason to think it has been reduced as much as one-third, and a billion and a half dollars, assuming the premise of the editorial to be correct, means about \$10 per capita. To reduce the circulation \$10 per capita is detrimental. I for one believe that one of the best things that could be done to relieve the economic situation in this country would be to have a well-ordered inflation of our currency. We can not have a well-ordered per capita increase in our circulation unless we have some basis for it, and I think the silver in our country offers an opportunity for this well-ordered increase rather than to undertake to do it upon the credit of the Government without having gold or silver behind it. The world situation is very complicated. The situation in our own country is such that we can at least look into this thing in a courageous and in a practical way. This can be done by one of the leading committees of the House in order that we may better understand the situation. The situation is vastly different from what it was 30 years ago, when, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] said, Mr. Bryan made his race. Many countries have gone off the gold standard. We can not alone expect to dictate the standards of the world when we are a creditor and an exporting nation. When this international conference comes we ought to have this information so that we may deal with it in a scientific and practical manner. I join with my colleague from Nebraska in saying that we have a committee of this House with a chairman that has ability and an unbiased interest to go into this question to get the information on which to legislate. I trust the resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FIXING THE TIME OF ASSEMBLING OF CONGRESS

Mr. POULSON, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 133

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 14, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress.

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided

and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, the Senate joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and the amendment thereto to final passage without intervening action except one motion to recommit.

TESTIMONY OF ASSESSOR IN CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill S. 9, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. This is District day. The gentleman from Maryland calls up the bill, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in any action for the condemnation of lands in the District of Columbia the assessor of the District shall not be disqualified, by reason of the fact that he holds the office of assessor, from testifying as an expert witness to the market value of such lands and as to benefits.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the gentleman from Maryland relinquished the floor, and is the matter now open to debate?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is entitled to one hour. Of course, if he should not move the previous question, any other gentleman getting the floor would likewise have an hour. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I shall take five minutes. This is a bill to permit the District assessor in the District of Columbia to testify in court in cases of condemnation. Some time ago the assessor testified in a case in which the jury brought in a verdict of \$105,000 for some property within the District. The case was taken to the supreme court, and the supreme court ruled that the assessor was disqualified to testify as an expert.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. There is but one point bothering me. Will this permit the assessor to testify against the Government?

Mr. PALMISANO. This will permit the assessor to testify. I would not say that he would be against the Government. He would be there more or less in behalf of the Government.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Could he testify as an expert on valuations when the Government is condemning property and testify against the Government?

Mr. KELLER. He could testify to the truth.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. As an expert, he does not testify as to facts. His testimony is opinion evidence. I am inquiring whether the bill is broad enough to permit an employee of the District of Columbia, the assessor, to testify as an expert for property owners against the Government.

Mr. PALMISANO. While the bill does not specifically state, it would give him the right to do so, but it seems to me that as an employee of the District of Columbia he would not testify against the Government.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I should think not, but I have had it happen to me in New York.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. This legislation is intended and has been introduced to overcome an adverse decision of the appellate division of the supreme court.

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes. The supreme court held that the assessor was disqualified to testify. In the first trial, when he testified, a verdict was brought in for \$105,000. Subsequently the case was tried again, and a verdict of \$295,000 was rendered for that same property without the testimony of the assessor, and the District refused to take the property.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. BOYLAN. Of course, these proceedings are conducted by a justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, who is assigned by the chief justice?

Mr. PALMISANO. That is correct.

Mr. BOYLAN. And the jury is chosen in the regular way and the procedure of the supreme court is adopted in trying these cases. Is that not true?

Mr. PALMISANO. That is true.

Mr. BOYLAN. Then by the passage of this bill we would qualify an employee of the District of Columbia to testify as an expert, whether or not under the rules of the court he was able to qualify as an expert, in a case in which the District government is a party to the condemnation case. Is that not true?

Mr. PALMISANO. This gives him the right to qualify as a witness.

Mr. BOYLAN. Exactly. Now, I would like to call the attention of the lawyers of this House to the fact that by the passage of this bill we are making a man competent to give legal testimony who otherwise would not be competent to give such testimony. In other words, we make an expert by legislation instead of by the expert qualifying himself.

Mr. PALMISANO. I do not agree with the gentleman from New York that the assessor would be made competent to testify by this law. He would perhaps be an expert in all cases before the court, but it seems to me the object of the bill is to permit him to testify in cases where the District is interested.

Mr. BOYLAN. That is the point I make. The District of Columbia is a party to the condemnation case, and the District brings one of its own employees to bolster up its own case. What chance has the ordinary citizen against a combination of that kind?

Mr. FIESINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. FIESINGER. The District assessor makes a valuation on a piece of property. Under the laws that exist now he can not come into court and testify as to the valuation he has made. Is that right?

Mr. PALMISANO. That is right.

Mr. FIESINGER. But under this law the District assessor may come in and testify as to the value he has placed upon a particular piece of property against the owner of the piece of property, who may give a value much less than the amount fixed by the District assessor? That is the object and purpose of this bill?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. PARSONS. In a condemnation case in the District of Columbia who and how many experts have been called in those cases to testify for the Government and for the property owners? Do they usually have more than one expert on those trials?

Mr. PALMISANO. I assume they have. Of course, I am not familiar with the details.

Mr. PARSONS. And using the assessor in cases that might arise in the future, nothing contained therein, of course, would bar the Government or the property owner from subpoenaing and having qualified as experts other men who might be presumed to know values?

Mr. PALMISANO. There is no question but that in the case of condemnation proceedings the Government, as well as the individual, may employ experts in addition to this employee. It seems to me that a man who is an assessor, if a man familiar with properties in the District of Columbia and an employee of the District of Columbia, certainly ought to be able to tell the jurors just what he observes and the value he places on that property. That is all this bill permits.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. As I understand, this bill comes from the gentleman's committee, and it is the opinion of the gentleman's committee that this bill is a step toward preventing the holdups that the Government has been forced to go through in condemnation proceedings since time began with the Government. Is that true?

Mr. PALMISANO. There is no question about it. It shows that the people of the District of Columbia consider the value of this assessor's testimony, when they gave a

verdict of \$105,000 with his testimony, and then without his testimony they gave a verdict of \$295,000. The District of Columbia was compelled to abandon that property because of the excess in value.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. We had that holdup with the National Aboretum, where we started with a high and holy purpose of buying this magnificent site, and the very first proposition we ran up against was the holdup of a lot of these real-estate brigands in Washington, to defeat the purpose of the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. There is nothing in this bill to be construed as being the intent of Congress that the bill is permissive of permitting the assessor to be retained by outside interests to testify as an expert against the Government. Is that not true?

Mr. PALMISANO. There is nothing here that gives that permission.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And if the assessor would do that, in all likelihood he would be discharged, and should be discharged.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield me some time on this matter?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes. I will later.

This bill merely gives him the right to testify. It does not disqualify him because of the mere fact that he is an employee of the District of Columbia. That is all that is provided by this bill. I presume that the assessor himself, if he were not in the employ of the District of Columbia, would be qualified as an expert. This bill merely permits him to testify for the District of Columbia in the event the District of Columbia desires to use him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks, as the gentleman says, to lift the ban that is now laid upon the assessor of the District of Columbia in testifying in condemnation proceedings as to values. The decision cited in the report shows that the assessor was barred from giving his testimony as to value because upon cross-examination he would certainly be obliged to refer to the assessed value, and the trial judge stated that it was not competent to bring into the trial of the case the assessed value of the property.

I might have doubts as to whether I would favor such a measure in my home city or other cities, but here in the District, where it is proverbial that the Government has been held up in nearly every instance, I certainly favor the policy of bringing relief to the Government by allowing the assessor, who would be a competent and qualified witness, to testify as to the value of the land. In the report the District commissioner calls attention to the fact that naturally the assessor is one of the best-posted men as to values. His assessment must necessarily be based upon recent sales of real estate, and he has those sales as a basis for his opinion as to present values.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] raises the question as to whether or not the assessor might be called upon to testify against the Government as to property values, but I can not conceive how any public-spirited servant of the District would do otherwise, when called upon as an expert, than to give his honest opinion as to the value of a property.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman is a distinguished and able lawyer and is one of the hardest workers on the floor of this House, yet he has condemned his own argument. He has said he would not favor this for his own home city.

Mr. STAFFORD. I said I might not favor it for my own home city.

Mr. BOYLAN. But he would favor it as against the downtrodden people of the District, who have not a friend in the world.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; they have.

Mr. BOYLAN. According to the gentleman's own statement, he is perfectly willing to inflict this on the dog, which is here represented by the District of Columbia.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no; not at all. We have this condition confronting us: The commissioner says that they spend a large amount for expert testimony and that that can be avoided by using the assessor in testifying as to the value of property. The assessor is better acquainted with the value of property here than any other person in the District and his would be better expert testimony. The only trouble is that in his examination he might be obliged to refer to the assessed value; but even if that be necessary, why should not that fact be called to the attention of the condemnation jury?

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. It is stated by the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia that—

It is widely recognized that appraisements by the tax assessors for purposes of taxation are not admissible in evidence in condemnation proceedings.

Does the gentleman approve of this position, that the assessor's valuations, on which taxpayers actually pay their taxes, should be excluded as evidence in the consideration of the value of a piece of land? Does it not seem to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this ought to be quite convincing evidence as to the true value of the land? If the value has been fixed by the assessor under his official oath at so much it ought to be admissible as evidence of the real value of the land, it seems to me, yet it appears that such evidence is excluded and the assessor himself disqualified as a witness in condemnation proceedings.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would certainly be willing in my own home city to accept the assessed value, because there the assessment is based upon the present value of the property; and under the present conditions, where values have gone down, the assessment has been reduced to conform to present-day values. So it seems to me there is no reason whatsoever why the assessed values should not be taken into consideration as an evidential fact.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am only interested in this bill as a Member of the Congress in seeing that equal and exact justice is done. It appears, and has been stated several times this afternoon, that Members favor this measure because it applies to the District of Columbia. Let us go back and find out who conducts these proceedings. They are not conducted by a commission appointed by the supreme court, as is the case in many of the States. The case is actually heard before a justice of the supreme court, who has been designated to sit in that part of the court by the chief justice of the supreme court. Surely we have confidence in the members of this court. Some of them are former Members of this body and of the body at the other side of the Capitol. They are all men of high reputation and character, so any criticism that is made as to the procedure followed therefore enters into the procedure of the Supreme Court of the District.

What does this bill propose to do? The report says:

The object of this bill is clearly stated in the title.

The title reads:

Respecting the qualifications of the assessor of the District of Columbia to testify in condemnation proceedings.

Then the report continues:

The necessity for legislation arises through the fact that the District Court of Appeals, in a recent action for condemnation of land for public use, held the assessor disqualified as an expert witness on land values because of his connection with the District government.

You lawyers will recognize your disadvantage if you go into a case against municipalities where by legislation an employee of the municipality is permitted to qualify as an expert witness. In your own States, cities, and towns you

know of cases where you have to take an action to review the action of the assessor. You do that because you are not satisfied with it. In the city of New York for the present tax year there were 80,000 objections filed with respect to different parcels of real estate throughout the city. In that case, and in many cases where the assessment has been higher than the market value of the property, there would be absolutely no redress if the word of the assessor is taken and it is held he is properly qualified to testify as to value.

What is the actual experience with reference to some of these assessors? I have known of men who secured the position of tax assessor who never sold or purchased a piece of real estate in their lives, men who merely had a theoretical or book knowledge of real estate, but who had not actually been engaged in a single transaction.

Now, why would you want to qualify a man of that type as against a man who can qualify before the courts, a man who has to submit his qualifications and who has to stand cross-examination on them, in order for the court to decide whether or not he is qualified to give such testimony?

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman leaves the impression that if this bill is enacted into law the assessor will be qualified to testify as an expert by reason of the official position that he may hold?

Mr. BOYLAN. Well, he will not be disqualified. It is the same thing. He will not be disqualified. What is the difference?

Mr. PATMAN. There is considerable difference.

Mr. BOYLAN. Very little to my mind in its practical application.

Mr. PATMAN. If this bill passes, he will not be qualified to testify as an expert unless it can be first shown that he is an expert.

Mr. BOYLAN. Exactly; and what has been his experience?

Mr. PATMAN. That is for the court to decide. His experience must be shown just like that of any other witness.

Mr. BOYLAN. But I am asking the gentleman, what has been his qualification?

Mr. PATMAN. That is a question to be passed on in each individual case.

Mr. BOYLAN. His qualifications would rest solely on his experience in assessing property. That would be his only qualification.

Mr. PATMAN. This bill does not make him qualified by reason of the fact he is the assessor.

Mr. BOYLAN. No; but it does not disqualify him, and what is his background?

Mr. PATMAN. If he is otherwise qualified, this should not disqualify him.

Mr. BOYLAN. For many years he has been a tax assessor. What other qualifications can he have, because under the law he can not engage in the real-estate business while he is an employee of the tax office?

Mr. PATMAN. That is a question for the court to decide in each individual case.

Mr. BOYLAN. I am asking the gentleman to state some other qualification that he could have, and the gentleman can not do it.

Mr. PATMAN. Suppose Mr. Richards should resign and some one else should take the office to-morrow, and a case should come up and the new assessor should take the witness stand, he would first have to be shown to be an expert in that line of work.

Mr. BOYLAN. But as an assessor how can he show any experience other than his experience as an assessor?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, his observations.

Mr. BOYLAN. He can not engage in business and hold this job at the same time.

Mr. PATMAN. He knows more about the real-estate business than any other one man in the city.

Mr. BOYLAN. He might claim that he does, but, gentlemen, we are told here by the distinguished gentleman who immediately preceded me, a man for whom I have

the highest admiration not only as a lawyer but as an individual and as a Member of the Congress, that he is willing to try this on the District but not on his home town. I admire the gentleman for his frankness. I admire him for his honesty in making this statement.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hardly think the gentleman has quoted me correctly. I think I stated explicitly that so far as my home city is concerned, I would permit the assessor to testify because there assessments are based on the actual value.

Mr. BOYLAN. That was a supplemental statement of the gentleman, and I accept that as a supplemental statement.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was a statement made after an interruption by the illuminary remark of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOYLAN. The bare fact is this, gentlemen, and you lawyers should realize the importance of it: It has been said that it is left to the House to go into fine points of parliamentary procedure and legal procedure. You ought to see how unfair it is in having the District a party to a litigation and then under a law that we pass be able to take in an employee of the District, who naturally will have to stand by the District or else lose his job, to testify for the District. Could anything be more unfair? It has been said that the District is governed by alien Representatives who have no love or regard for the District. Irrespective of that, I only speak to you on a mere matter of justice. You men practicing in other States and in other courts would not be satisfied with legislation of this kind; and knowing, as I do, your sentiments about this matter, I say to you why should you perpetrate a glaring and a flagrant injustice upon the District such as this bill would perpetrate?

I am not in favor of excessive awards for any property anywhere, but I believe that the market price should be paid; and surely, before a justice of the supreme court and a competent jury or where cases can be tried in equity before a justice of the supreme court, exact justice there would be rendered. I am sure if we have any respect for our supreme court we will at least repose this confidence in them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one more minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would just like to know if the gentleman thinks that the demand for this legislation comes from the brigands who were spoken of by the gentleman on the other side of the House a moment ago in an effort to add another recruit to their force.

Mr. BOYLAN. It may be. I do not quite understand about the additional place.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As a matter of fact, it is the people who are interested in a square deal between the Government and the people who have property that is being condemned, and that is what is sought by this legislation.

Mr. BOYLAN. As I understand, the District is seeking it, not the people. The people are going to be mulcted by this legislation. The District will have an ace in the hole, their paid employee to come in and testify.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The District is making an effort to get the land just as cheap as possible and get a square deal.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FIESINGER].

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Speaker, I hate to disagree with my good friend from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] on this bill. I take it that he is not favorable to it. I am favorable to the bill, and I want to state my reasons, because they are based on some experience.

In my State of Ohio it was the common law that a tax authority could not testify as to the assessed value of real estate. It sometimes worked out that a man whose land was being condemned would come into court and testify that it was worth about twice as much as he had given the value to the tax assessor when the assessment was made up.

So that in my State the Legislature of Ohio passed a law to circumvent that kind of procedure and to allow tax authorities to come into court and testify as to the value upon the tax duplicate of that piece of property, sometimes made up on the value given by the owner and sometimes made up in part by figures given by the owner as to value.

Now, the reason for the ruling of the court was that when the tax is made up, when the valuation is assessed, there was no opportunity for the man who owned property to cross-examine—in other words, he did not have his day in court.

The legislature of my State, in the passage of the law, said that makes no difference, that the tax authority that makes the valuation shall have a right to go into court and testify, where they formerly did not have that right.

I have acted as a judge in cases where that proposition has come up both ways, and I am free to state that I think justice is worked out in nine times out of ten by taxing authorities testifying as to assessed values.

Now, that is the principle proposed in this bill. It does not allow a man to ask an extravagant value for property, without allowing the assessor to come in and state what was the assessed value as against this man who asks an extravagant price.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIESINGER. Yes.

Mr. COX. It is the law of the District that the owner of property can not come in and contest the assessment made against him.

Mr. FIESINGER. As I understand it, the assessor now can not testify in court as to the value he has put on a particular piece of property, and the object of this legislation is to say that he may come into court and testify.

Mr. COX. You simply remove the prohibition of the law against the assessor coming in and testifying.

Mr. BOYLAN. In other words, by the bill you permit a man to become an expert who is not an expert under the present regulations. Is not that right?

Mr. FIESINGER. I think the law contemplates that a man who is able to go out and make up assessments on property—by virtue of the fact that he has that ability—qualifies him as an expert.

Mr. BOYLAN. The law now disqualifies him.

Mr. FIESINGER. The law now disqualifies him, but this is to remove that disqualification.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. BOYLAN. The assessor can not have two opinions.

Mr. FIESINGER. He ought not to.

Mr. BOYLAN. He can not have an opinion as an assessor and then another opinion as to the market value.

Mr. FIESINGER. As I understand the law, the assessed value is predicated upon the market value. At least, that is so in my State. I do not know how it is in the District of Columbia. In my State the tax valuation must be the market value.

Mr. BOYLAN. If you agree that the assessed value is the market value, then you are putting before the court the assessed value of the property.

Mr. FIESINGER. That is right.

Mr. MILLARD. The laws of the State of New York are contrary to those of the State of Ohio. The assessed valuation is not admissible evidence.

Mr. FIESINGER. That was so in the State of Ohio until a few years ago. You could not give that in testimony as against an exorbitant claim for the property.

Mr. MILLARD. That is still the law of our State.

Mr. FIESINGER. That is not the law of Ohio.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLANTON). The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is now on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOYLAN) there were—ayes 54, noes 1.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RELIEVING THE DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS OF CERTAIN MINISTERIAL DUTIES

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2077) to relieve the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of certain ministerial duties, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the passage of this act it shall be lawful for the secretary of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or in his absence or upon his inability to act, such person as said commissioners may designate, when so directed by said commissioners, to execute in the name of the District of Columbia or of said board, by attaching thereto his signature as such secretary and affixing when requisite the seal of said District, any deed, contract, pleading, lease, release, regulation, notice, or other paper, which heretofore said commissioners were required to execute by subscribing thereto their respective signatures: *Provided,* That prior to such signing, and sealing if requisite, said deed, contract, pleading, lease, release, regulation, notice, or other paper shall first have been considered and approved by said board of commissioners, or a majority of them, sitting as a board, and evidence of such consideration and approval shall be reduced to writing and recorded in the minutes of said board of commissioners, which minutes shall thereafter be signed by the members of said board of commissioners or a majority thereof.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of the House are familiar with this bill. It permits the District Commissioners to issue a summons to have civilians testify in cases of investigation. The bill is unanimously reported by the committee. I find no opposition to it.

Mr. KELLER. What is the bill about?

Mr. PALMISANO. It authorizes the District Commissioners, in case of a hearing, for instance, of the police board, to summon civilians to testify. At the present time civilians may ignore them and the commissioners are compelled to go into court. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADDRESS OF HON. RUTH PRATT, OF NEW YORK

Mr. PARKER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein a speech delivered by my colleague, Mrs. PRATT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech of my colleague, Mrs. RUTH PRATT, at the luncheon of the National Republican Club, New York City, Saturday, February 6, 1932, entitled "Need for a Wider Tax Base."

The speech is as follows:

"NEED FOR WIDER TAX BASE"

The Budget and financial program laid before Congress by the President furnished a complete picture of the serious situation confronting the Federal Government. On the one hand, we must meet materially increased expenditures because of the extension of benefits to veterans and their dependents, the enlargement and hastening of the Nation's public-works program to relieve unemployment, the outlay of vast sums to aid agriculture and a larger postal deficit. On the other hand, we have witnessed a drastic and precipitous decline in revenue.

Hence, instead of the usual surpluses, we incurred a deficit of almost \$903,000,000 during the last fiscal year, and are facing a prospective deficit of \$2,123,000,000—almost half the probable expenditures—this year. For the fiscal year which begins July 1, despite an estimated increase of \$337,000,000 in revenues expected as a result of some improvement in economic conditions, and a decline in losses from sales of capital assets as offsets, together with reductions of \$365,000,000 in expenditures proposed, a deficit of \$1,417,000,000 is in prospect. We are thus confronted with two alternatives—to continue spending in excess of income, with a

consequent rise in the national debt, or to balance the Budget forthwith.

Some of my colleagues and a number of economists have suggested the former procedure. They point to the fact that we have reduced the national debt to the extent of nearly three and one-half billion dollars in excess of statutory requirements, and argue that we can afford to absorb a deficit of at least that much now. The surpluses which made this possible they would consider a reserve on which we should draw in hard times. It should be realized, however, that these surpluses resulted mainly from the sale of capital assets, themselves acquired with money derived from bond sales, and accordingly should have been used for no other purpose than the wiping out of the debt incurred for their acquisition. Then, too, this reserve has already been very nearly offset by the deficits of this year and last.

But what will be the attitude of investors if the Government should disregard every sound axiom of business judgment and persist in making commitments in excess of its ability to meet them? Such a temporizing policy would endanger the national credit and force the output of huge issues of securities which would remain to plague our fiscal policies in the future. It would make more difficult the coming task of retiring or refunding the \$6,268,000,000 of fourth Liberty loan $4\frac{1}{4}$ per cent bonds which become callable in November, 1933, and mature in 1938. Please remember that we have not the enthusiasm of war-time psychology to aid us in marketing immense volumes of bonds, nor have we the virtual unanimity of opinion and purpose so essential for success in such a task. But even if it could again be mobilized, it would simply mean postponing the evil day. Ultimately the taxes would have to be levied—and with interest.

No; the wisest course to pursue is to balance the Budget as soon as possible. It is impossible to do so this year. The deficit is too great and the year is already more than half gone. The program of the administration is to reduce this year's expected deficit so as to prevent an increase in the debt, to balance the Budget next year, and to make the statutory requirements for debt reduction fully effective during the fiscal year 1934. With this end in view have its tax and expenditure programs been developed.

The realization that Uncle Sam has no inexhaustible fund which replenishes itself as fast as it is used up to meet the demands made upon it must have come as a great shock to the average citizen. Nor is he running a profitable business enterprise bringing him a constant stream of golden wealth; and he has no private income; hence no bulging personal pocketbook.

To pay for the services rendered by the Government, we, the citizens and beneficiaries, must put our hands into our pockets and take therefrom part of the funds intended for our personal needs as consumers. If we insist on extraordinary expenditures, either for additional functions or to provide more subsidies for particular groups or sections of the country, we must expect an additional drain on our pocketbooks. That drain comes inevitably in one way or another. There is no escape. Directly or indirectly we all share, though we may be led to think otherwise. As the President said last February, in vetoing the bill for increasing the loan value of the veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates, it is the millions of hard-working families who, "in the last analysis, must bear the burden of increasing Government aid and taxes. It is not the rich who suffer. When we take employment and taxes from our people it is the poor who suffer."

Whether he knows it or not everyone pays taxes; but as no one likes to pay them knowingly, certain principles of tax gathering have grown up during the ages to make the process less painful. They are summed up in the colloquial phrase "plucking the most feathers with the least squawk." This involves: (1) Simplicity of administration, with its corollary, difficulty of avoidance; (2) adequate productivity to meet the need; and (3) political expediency, which means that, to provoke the least possible popular resentment, the fewer points at which the tax is collected, the better politically.

Combined with the doctrine of "benefit," these principles earmarked the ownership of property as the best index of taxability; and the property tax is still the chief reliance of the localities as well as of most of our States. More recently, however, as the continued assumption of additional welfare activities by the units of government made imperative the finding of more lucrative revenue sources, and partly because of a desire to "secure social justice" and "equalize the distribution of wealth," there has arisen a different tax principle—that of "ability to pay." Progressive taxation as we now know it is the result; and as experience proved that the taxation of intangible property, which is frequently more indicative of taxpaying ability than is tangible, presented insurmountable administrative problems, it was applied especially to business and personal incomes and on the estates of decedents, because shifting, which is common to practically all forms of indirect taxes, would be difficult if not wholly impossible.

These, then, are the tests applied by the Federal Government in the development of its tax system, as also by a few of the progressive States. While they seem on the whole to be sound and acceptable, the results have not been entirely beneficial. That there are some disadvantages must be apparent.

In the first place there are, unfortunately, very few sources of revenue available that meet these tests, as can be seen from an analysis of the Federal Treasury's income. The most important single source are the income taxes, which yield from 56 to 58 per cent of the total and which are divided almost equally between individual and corporate incomes. Next in importance come the miscellaneous internal revenues, accounting for some 15 or 17 per cent. Tobacco taxes, which have proven to be fairly stable, make

up three-quarters of this group, most of the balance being made up in almost equal proportions of estate taxes on the one hand and stamp taxes, chiefly on the issue and sale of securities and on playing cards, on the other. Customs duties, which have usually furnished almost as much money as the miscellaneous internal revenues, declined to 12 per cent this year. Since 1924 these three sources, which thus account for 85 per cent of the Government's total income, have now fallen below 83 per cent, and in 1929 they amounted to as much as 89 per cent. Of the balance, from a third to a half comes from the proceeds of foreign government obligations; and all other sources, including some \$25,000,000 annually from Panama Canal tolls, provide the remainder.

Because the sources are so few which meet the tests there is a constant clash of interest between the Nation and the States as they attempt to take full advantage of the possibilities in the course of developing their revenue systems. The inheritance tax, for example, is shared by both jurisdictions, the State tax being allowed as an offset to the extent of 80 per cent of the Federal levy. Many are taxed by both, or are likely to be, presenting the danger that between them they may "kill the goose that laid the golden egg." The situation has become so serious that Under Secretary of the Treasury Ogden L. Mills has proposed a survey to delimit the fields of these respective jurisdictions and to determine their just claims.

Another inherent difficulty is the fact that except for the tobacco taxes, which have grown steadily and remained comparatively stable even under adverse conditions, the yield is uncertain because too dependent on business prosperity. This is obviously true of customs receipts, which, as a result of the drop in both the value and the volume of imports, fell one-third to \$378,000,000 in 1931. The direct relationship between the economic situation and business profits, from which most income taxes come, is such that the depression can to some extent be measured by the yield, which is estimated this year to be approximately half that of 1930. Of an anticipated loss in taxes amounting to \$1,530,000,000 during the current fiscal year, income taxes will be responsible for \$1,271,000,000.

But it is the individual income tax that exemplifies most strikingly the susceptibility to variation with the cycles of prosperity and depression. Returns for the calendar year 1930 filed up to the end of August numbered 3,376,552. Of these, 1,430,000, or 42 per cent, yielded no tax. Another 1,689,000, slightly more than half (though seven-eighths of those taxable), paid only 6 per cent of the tax, \$27,840,000. The remaining 257,640 returns, 7½ per cent of the total, yielded \$445,850,000, or more than 94 per cent of the taxes paid. In 1930, 14,816 individuals, one-third of 1 per cent of the 4,034,702 who filed returns, paid \$653,390,000 on their 1929 incomes—65.2 per cent of the total tax. On the 3,012,256 returns with net incomes under \$5,000, three-quarters of all returns filed, only \$4,387,261 was paid, less than half of 1 per cent of the total tax.

It is clear that a very small number of large and comparatively large incomes bear practically the full burden of the individual income tax. Yet it is these large incomes which are most susceptible to the widest variations because they include business profits, and even more because in recent years the element of gain or loss from the sale of capital assets has had a preponderating influence. The facts are readily discernible in a comparison of the returns for the calendar years 1928 and 1930.

There was a slight increase in the number of taxable incomes under \$5,000, but a decrease of 15 per cent in the returns filed and of 16 per cent in the tax. Incomes from \$5,000 to \$10,000 showed a decrease of 20 per cent in number and 27 per cent in the tax. From \$10,000 to \$100,000 they fell 31 per cent in number and 49 per cent in the tax paid; whereas incomes of \$100,000 and over decreased 61 per cent in number and 67 per cent in the tax paid on them. The larger the incomes, it will be seen, the greater the decrease in the number of returns and even more in the amount of the tax. Naturally the fluctuations are magnified by the progressive rates imposed, which result in taxes rising faster than incomes, and conversely, falling with greater rapidity as they recede into the lower brackets.

Surely it should not require much more to indicate how dangerously narrow is the base on which rests our most important source of revenue. In 1928 and 1929 we had a population of approximately 120,000,000, consisting of nearly 30,000,000 families, with more than 70,000,000 adults over 19 years of age, of whom some 45,000,000 were gainfully employed. Yet only about 2,500,000 individuals contributed directly to the expenses of our National Government through the medium of its most lucrative single tax, which provides from a quarter to a third of the total revenues.

Figuring only one taxpayer to the family, although there were some 125,000 wives who filed separate returns, it meant that only about 1 family in 12 knowingly contributed anything to the Federal exchequer, no matter how little. Compare this with the situation in Great Britain, where, out of a population of only little more than 40,000,000, 2,250,000 paid income taxes—only a quarter million fewer income-tax payers, although the population was about one-third as large as ours.

The needed revenues can not be secured merely by increasing the surtax rates on the present group of taxpayers. It is estimated that the income-tax collections during this calendar year will not exceed \$300,000,000, of which 70 per cent will come from surtaxes. If these be increased by 100 per cent, it would mean the collection of not more than \$200,000,000 additional during the current year. Even if the maximum surtax rates be tripled, rising to 60 per cent on incomes over \$100,000, the theoretical increase would be only \$120,000,000 during the calendar year. This would not go far

toward solving the problem of meeting the huge deficits in sight, even if it did not result in driving such incomes into tax-exempt securities.

Not only would it be impossible thus alone to obtain enough additional revenues, but it is feared that the liquid resources available for restoring much-needed working capital would dry up, as would also the means of furnishing the Treasury's financing in the near future. It is my fear that it may likewise destroy the resources of a comparatively small group who tax themselves voluntarily to maintain the numerous philanthropic institutions and welfare activities, which are still in private control and likely to remain so, although rendering a public service, recognized as such, and hence usually not only tax exempt but also tax supported in part.

It has been estimated that, exclusive of churches and religious activities, the sums thus provided have grown to anywhere from one and one-fourth to one and one-half billion dollars annually, almost as much as the amount spent by all the States for maintenance, operation, and interest. It would work havoc if it were to become impossible for these individuals to continue their support. Already there are indications of what it might mean in the announced liquidation of the Institute for Child Guidance and the reported deficits facing many hospitals and educational institutions which may compel their closing. Who would suffer in such event? Certainly not the rich.

The basic concept that underlies the entire program submitted by the Treasury Department is that the many not now taxed who are in a position to make some contribution to the support of the Government should be asked to do so, taking into consideration ability to pay. As Mr. Mills said in his statement to the Ways and Means Committee, this concept "must form a part of any program, for without it a solution is impossible, and it is justified not only by necessity but by equity and sound policy."

Accordingly it was suggested that we return in principle to the general plan of the 1924 revenue act, with some changes made necessary by present conditions. I am not going to discuss the details of the entire program, except as concerns the personal income tax. In addition to a sharp increase in rates, it involves a reimposition of the tax on many who, because of very high exemptions, have been freed of the obligation to contribute directly to the support of their Government, although able to furnish the very moderate amounts called for. This would add nearly 1,750,000 taxpayers and result in a net increase of slightly more than \$25,000,000 from those with net incomes under \$5,000. From those with incomes of from \$5,000 to \$10,000 an additional \$13,300,000 is expected; from those with incomes up to \$25,000, somewhat more than \$15,000,000 additional; and \$169,000,000 more from those with incomes above \$25,000.

Now, what will be the result on those in the lowest income brackets? A single person with no dependents earning \$2,000 a year will pay \$15, and \$30 if he earns \$3,000. If married and having one child, he will pay only \$1.50 on a \$3,000 income, or still no tax if there are two children until his income exceeds \$3,300. On \$4,000 he would pay only \$16.50 if he has one child, and \$10.50 if he has two. With one child an income of \$5,000 will call for a tax of only \$31.50, as compared with \$650 in Great Britain, where the personal exemptions are only \$485 for a single person, \$730 if married, with \$245 for the first child and \$195 for each additional. On a net income of \$10,000 the tax here would be \$153 and \$1,800 in Great Britain.

How slight is the burden on the average American can be seen even better from the report of the International Inquiry into the Cost of Living, which was made early last year at the request of the Ford Motor Co., based on the standards of living of the average Ford worker in Detroit receiving the minimum wage. It shows that workers in various European cities who earned the equivalent of his \$1,550, which will be less than half the level required to pay any tax at all, would have to pay from \$11 to \$95 in taxes, representing from 1 to 8 per cent of these incomes.

A study made by a Swedish economist and former Minister of Finance, based on 1930 conditions, shows that whereas the average American paid almost nothing on incomes up to \$4,500, one-fifth of 1 per cent on incomes of \$7,500, and less than one-half of 1 per cent on \$10,000, in Germany and France they paid 5½ per cent on incomes of \$2,000, 9½ to 11½ per cent on \$4,500, nearly 15 per cent on \$7,500, and up to 18½ per cent on \$10,000. Compared with Europeans, the average American is practically, if not actually, exempt from income taxation.

Of course, it is not popular politically to talk of reducing exemptions and restoring to the tax rolls the voters who had been taken off. In a representative government like ours, however, it is highly desirable. If he were called upon to pay directly what he is now paying indirectly, the citizen would see that he is not getting off scot-free, as he thinks. If he could know when he makes up his personal budget how much he is being called upon to contribute to its support, it would give him a greater interest in his Government. He would watch it more closely to see how efficiently and for what purpose his contribution is being used. Surely that is the lesson taught us by present citizen interest in their local governments, to which, by virtue of home ownership and property taxation, a much larger proportion contribute directly than to the National Government.

That citizen interest can be measured by tax consciousness is evident by the voting record in New York State. In New York City, where four families out of five live in rented quarters, less than 40 per cent of those eligible to vote by age and citizenship went to the polls to vote for governor in 1930, 45 per cent for

mayor in 1929, and, despite the interest aroused by the national campaign of 1928, less than 55 per cent for President. Outside of New York City, however, where general and farm ownership means that a much larger proportion of the voters pay taxes of some kind, from 55 to 60 per cent of the voters went to the polls in 1930 and 80 per cent or more in 1928.

In closing I ask everyone within sound of my voice to give fullest cooperation to the Government in the supremely difficult task it is facing so courageously. Naturally all of us have preconceived notions on most things, and our minds would be dead set against any proposal set forth by the Government. It is only human to try to avoid taxes and to suggest that they be imposed on the other fellow, who can always afford to pay them better than we can. What we need is greater flexibility in our attitude toward the problem. We must discard this rigidity of the frozen mind just as the Government is striving to thaw out the frozen assets of the people and get them into liquid form. We should be generous enough to look at the entire picture as the Government must see it, and realize that we can not individually be the judge of the need. Rather must each one of us bear a share of the burden for the common good.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSION, GEORGE WASHINGTON
BICENTENNIAL

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1306) to provide for the incorporation of the District of Columbia Commission, George Washington Bicentennial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland calls up a Senate bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The bill which the gentleman calls up was before the House two weeks ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is unfinished business. We have had a second reading of the bill at the former meeting when the bill was considered on last District day.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the previous question was voted down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question was then voted down. It is before the House now for further consideration, just where we left off before.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I ask recognition in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO], who is the ranking majority member of the committee, is entitled to recognition first to offer committee amendments, and then the gentleman from New York will be recognized.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I assume that when this bill is now brought up we are brought back to the same legislative situation we were in when it was last considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. The previous question was then voted down. At that moment any person who wished to propose an amendment would have had the privilege of being recognized. I claim that any person who wishes to offer an amendment has prior recognition to the gentleman from Maryland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. But the previous question having been voted down, it did not take off the floor the gentleman from Maryland, who stands in the position of chairman of the committee, so the parliamentarian informs the Chair.

Mr. STAFFORD. The very fact that the previous question was voted down granted the right to the opposition to offer an amendment and have control of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is another date on this legislation, and while it is in the same situation the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Maryland first, as acting chairman of his committee, and later will recognize some Member who is opposed to the bill.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry. Do we understand that the gentleman from Maryland will be recognized for one hour and then the opponents of the bill be recognized for one hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland, as acting chairman of the committee, is recognized first to offer committee amendments, and if some Member does not move the previous question—

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I take issue with the ruling of the Chair, because the House has affirmatively decided that the opposition is entitled to recognition, the pre-

vious question having been voted down. In the consideration of this bill we are placed in the same situation as we were when it was last considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. On a previous District day when this bill was up for consideration, the previous question was moved and the House voted down that motion. Then the opposition clearly was entitled to recognition. This is another legislative day; and that being true, it is the duty of the Chair to recognize the one standing as chairman of the committee, who is the gentleman from Maryland, to offer committee amendments. Then the Chair will recognize some one in opposition to the bill. The Chair is advised by the parliamentarian that such is the correct procedure.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can not follow the statement of the Chair that the bill is coming before the House de novo. The Chair properly stated that the bill now is the unfinished business. A bill can not change its status because it is the unfinished business and carried over to another day. The previous question having been voted down, the bill is now open to the House for amendment, and on that I have asked for recognition by the Chair to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will rule that the one acting for the committee in calling up the bill has a right to first offer committee amendments. If the proceedings had continued on the day the previous question was voted down, then any Member opposing the bill gaining recognition could have offered an amendment; but this being another legislative day, it is the duty of the Chair to recognize the acting chairman of the committee in calling up the bill to offer committee amendments, and the Chair has done that. Regardless of his own opinion, the Chair is guided by the parliamentarian. When a parliamentary situation arises whereby the Chair can recognize some one opposed to the bill, the Chair will do that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the Chair permit this observation? The Chair has taken the position that, as far as this bill is concerned, the Chair will recognize the fact that the bill has been read a second time on a prior occasion, and yet the Chair by his ruling does not recognize the fact that the previous question was voted down, which gave the opposition the right to offer amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the House that the private opinion of the present occupant of the chair [Mr. BLANTON] is the same as that of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], but the Chair is following the parliamentarian of the House in this matter, and as long as we have a parliamentarian the Chair will follow him. That is the opinion of the parliamentarian.

The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. PALMISANO. I will say for the benefit of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Wisconsin that the gentleman from Maryland does not intend to move the previous question until the Members of the House will have an opportunity to be heard, and I will say for the benefit of the Members that all objections that were made on last Monday have been corrected by amendments which we have made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Maryland can probably expedite matters by either yielding half of his time to the opposition or by reserving his time and allowing some Member of the opposition to be recognized.

Mr. PATTERSON. Well, will the gentleman yield for an amendment?

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent that these committee amendments may be read so that the Members will know what they are.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are no amendments before the House at this time.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that these amendments to be offered later by the committee be read for information of the Members.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Chair will permit, I think the gentleman from Maryland, without losing his rights, could ask unanimous consent that the amendments be offered and read for information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the amendments which the committee has adopted on the bill be read at this time for information. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "Campbell," insert the word "James A. Cobb";

Page 3, line 15, after the word "corporations," strike out lines 16 and 17 and insert a period;

Page 3, line 23, after the word "Sec.," strike out the figure "2" and insert the figure "4"; and insert the following additional sections:

"Sec. 2. That none of the persons herein named shall be entitled to or receive any of the profits of the corporation, but the same shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

"Sec. 3. That the corporation herein formed shall cease and determine, and all of the powers granted by paragraphs A, B, C, D, and F of section 1 of this act shall terminate upon the filing of its final report and audit with the Congress of the United States, which date shall not be later than February 1, 1933: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall operate to prevent the institution of any suit or claim at law or in equity by any person, firm, or corporation growing out of any act or omission of the corporation; provided that the institution of such suit or claim shall be commenced within the period limited by the provisions of chapter 41 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia: *Provided further,* That the Comptroller General be, and he hereby is, authorized to audit all accounts of the corporation, including the final audit thereof."

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to say that I am in hearty sympathy with the proposed amendments. They remove many of the objections which many Members on this side and, no doubt, on your side also had to the original bill. However, there is one provision to which I wish to direct the gentleman's attention, which has not been covered by the proposed amendments. That is in paragraph b, where authority is granted to this corporation to manufacture. It is difficult for me to conceive why the corporation should desire any authority to manufacture. I can understand how they may wish to purchase and acquire paraphernalia and the like, but I can not understand why they should desire authority to manufacture.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman from Maryland permit me to answer that?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. The idea is this: They are putting on, say, a pageant or play of some kind. Instead of buying the costumes they will manufacture them for the particular pageant or play. They will do that in the same way they will manufacture other little things in connection with other ceremonies. Suppose they wanted to use some flags. They would buy the material and put them together. It is not a case of manufacture or the sale of anything, but what they are trying to do is to get the biggest quantity for the few dollars they now have.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is a practical business man. In the cases cited by him wherein do our manufacturing establishments fail to meet those requirements? There is sufficient competition among the manufacturers of bunting, flags, and everything of that kind, so why should this corporation go into the business of manufacturing?

Mr. BLOOM. Because they can get the material much quicker, and it will be better than anything they could get by going outside.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not understand that the gentleman, representing, as he does, the great city of New York, believes in socialism or anything of that kind.

Mr. BLOOM. I am sorry the gentleman takes that view of it. This is simply for the purpose of enabling them to get costumes and things of that kind quickly and at a much cheaper price. They will take the raw materials, bring them

into a room, and make up what is desired. They will be able to do it a great deal better and cheaper than going into the open market for them. I will also say to the gentleman that you can not get these things in Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLANTON). The Chair will state that he recognized the gentleman from Maryland as the ranking majority member of the committee, to offer such amendments as the committee proposes. The Chair thinks, after that is done, the opposition is entitled to recognition. The Chair will recognize any member of the committee who is opposed to the bill, but if there is no member of the committee opposed to the bill then the Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA]. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland first to offer the committee amendments.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PALMISANO for the committee: On page 1, line 10, after the word "Campbell," insert "James A. Cobb."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PALMISANO for the committee: Page 3, line 15, after the word "corporations," insert a period and strike out lines 16 and 17.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the committee amendment that is now under consideration removes the primal objection which many gentlemen had to this bill when it was originally called up for consideration. Many Members feared that the privilege extended to the corporation of granting concessions might be abused. If the District is to be the host to thousands upon thousands of citizens of the country and is going to appropriately celebrate the bicentenary of Washington's birth, even though these citizens are of the highest caliber in the District, we do not wish to have some subordinate or appointee vested with authority to exact undue prices for any concessions that might be awarded. So I wish to compliment the chairman of the committee in offering this amendment, which removes a serious objection which some Members had to the bill when it was originally proposed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PALMISANO for the committee: Page 3, line 23, after the word "Sec.," strike out the figure "2" and insert the figure "4" and insert the following additional sections:

"Sec. 2. That none of the persons herein named shall be entitled to or receive any of the profits of the corporation, but the same shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

"Sec. 3. That the corporation herein formed shall cease and determine, and all of the powers granted by paragraphs A, B, C, D, and F of section 1 of this act shall terminate upon the filing of its final report and audit with the Congress of the United States, which date shall not be later than February 1, 1933: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall operate to prevent the institution of any suit or claim at law or in equity by any person, firm, or corporation growing out of any act or omission of the corporation: *Provided,* That the institution of such suit or claim shall be commenced within the period limited by the provisions of chapter 41 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia: *Provided further,* That the Comptroller General be, and he hereby is, authorized to audit all accounts of the corporation, including the final audit thereof."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the proposed amendment. There are two separate amendments proposed; one is section 2 and one is section 3, and they are different legislative proposals entirely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The proposed amendments are divisible. The question is on the first division of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the second division of the amendment.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask recognition on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question of a division of the amendment is not debatable. The question now is on the second division of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I surely know that the present occupant of the chair does not desire to establish a precedent that I know he is personally opposed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair stated that now that the committee amendments had been offered the Chair would now recognize the gentleman from New York in opposition to the bill and to offer amendments if he desired.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. More than that, Mr. Speaker, my interpretation of the rule is that the proposition is open to the floor, and when an amendment is offered any Member is entitled to recognition for or against the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No gentleman arose and asked recognition either for or against the committee amendments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will indulge me, I shall have to take issue with the position taken by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee amendments have been adopted. If the gentleman from New York desires recognition on any motion in opposition to the bill or to offer any further amendment, the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I desire recognition for the purpose of getting the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the first proposition before us, which I believe is more important than the passage of the bill or the merits of this particular bill, is the parliamentary situation.

The bill was before the House two weeks ago and was considered under the House rules. At that time the time was entirely under the control of the chairman of the committee, and after holding the floor for some time the gentleman from New Jersey moved the previous question and the previous question was voted down. Thereafter the House took up other business.

The bill comes back to us to-day and I submit that the previous question having been voted down the bill retains that status. It can not acquire a new status. The previous question having been voted down, that can not be ignored at this time; and that being so, the bill comes before the House as unfinished business, and the bill is before the House now for amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will so hold, that the bill is now before the House for amendment, but the committee had the right first to offer its committee amendments. If there are any other amendments, the Chair will recognize any Member to offer them.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I am not especially interested in this bill one way or the other, but I am interested in the procedure of the House, and my understanding is that always when the previous question is voted down the control goes from the chairman of the committee to the man who opposes the bill, because he is in the majority at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is exactly what the Chair believed, but the parliamentarian believed otherwise and was authority that the Chair thought should be followed.

Mr. SNELL. Granted that is so, I want to make my statement. If we had gone along with the business that day, the gentleman who would have been recognized next would have been some man opposed to the bill who wanted to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct, but no gentleman offered any amendment and no gentleman offered any motion, and the House adjourned, and this is another legislative day.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes; I was on my feet at the time.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] tried to get recognition at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman to-day tried to get recognition, generally, without offering either any motion or any amendment.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman was entitled to recognition, in my judgment. If the matter is brought up again as unfinished business, I maintain it must be taken up at exactly the same point at which we left it the other day, and the first man to be recognized, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] is leading the opposition, is the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the understanding of the Chair, and the Chair would so hold, provided the Member offered some motion or some amendment that would give him recognition.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] tried to get recognition, as I understand, and it was ruled that the chairman of the committee was entitled to preferential recognition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair was following the opinion of our parliamentarian. The gentleman from New York did not offer any motion and did not offer any amendment. If he had done this, the Chair is of the opinion that he should have been recognized.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from New York tried to get recognition and tried to get such recognition in opposition to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] to offer any amendment or to submit any motion.

Mr. SNELL. The question I am arguing is that in my judgment the gentleman should have had recognition first, because the control of the committee passed from the chairman to the gentlemen who were in the opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair [Mr. BLANTON] will state that he thinks the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] is eminently correct. The opposition in such a case is always entitled to recognition.

Mr. SNELL. I think that is the ruling that ought to be handed down, because it would be a mistake to hold otherwise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I am more concerned with the parliamentary question. I would be horrified at any other ruling, because the next time the present occupant of the chair and myself oppose a bill we want to be protected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair now finds that he can hold in accordance with his own views and at the same hold in accordance with the views of the parliamentarian, and the Chair so rules.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, the amendments that have been adopted to-day certainly remove a great many of the objections that we had to the bill the last time it was before the House. Particularly is that so with relation to the amendment striking out the language on page 3, lines 16 and 17, where this corporation under the original bill would have had the power to grant such concessions as might be desirable in connection with such corporation. That is stricken from the bill. We are to understand now that the corporation will have no such power in the bill as amended.

There are other objections that some Members are struggling with. I am glad that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is on the floor. With the construction of these stands and seats, and so on, and the programs as planned, the gentleman from New York knows that thousands and thousands of people will come to Washington. What assurance have we that when they get here the prices for the public stands will be within reason for these American citizens who want to take part in the celebration?

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman can depend on it that incorporators, who are representative citizens of the District of Columbia, will see that the prices are within reach of the public. The gentleman should remember that this is not a profit-making proposition.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I am glad the gentleman emphasizes that.

Mr. BLOOM. What they are trying to do is this: If the bill should not pass, they could not erect stands, they could not give any pageants. I want to emphasize the statement that they are not directly connected with the United States commission. We are helping them in every way that we possibly can, but this is a local proposition, and we are cooperating.

If we do not have this bill, they can not get a sufficient amount of money to build the stands. This is not to make money; it is to have some one able to handle money receive the cash and pay out the cash. The United States commission is not allowed to do it; we can not handle any money. If this bill should fail, you would not only stop the United States commission but you would stop the District commission from erecting these stands and producing the pageants.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman says the stands would not be built—the Government could appropriate the money to build the stands.

Mr. BLOOM. Then there is the maintenance and insurance. When you get stand builders to erect the stands they charge so much a seat. If there are a thousand seats, 50 cents a seat would be \$500. But it is not the stands alone, it is all the other things that go with them. We will have pageants, perhaps pageants inside; and we have to hire a hall and costumes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Is it the intention of the corporation to give the privilege to some private individual to build the stands and charge admission?

Mr. BLOOM. They could do it both ways. Suppose they had a large stand erected for a pageant. We would say, "You build this stand, and the price of admission shall be 50 cents." The man that builds the stand sells the seats to pay for it. It might be done that way. I can not, of course, commit this corporation to any method that they may use to operate it. I will say that there is no thought of making money out of it. The only thing that this bill seeks to do is to provide some way of raising the money and paying out the money and sufficient for maintenance.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman recollects that two weeks ago the question was raised quite properly and stressed, that there was great danger that this would be turned over to a private concern and monopolized in the charge of admission at the cost of the public and to the people of Washington.

Mr. BLOOM. That is impossible. It could not be done for this reason: The United States commission and the District commission are cooperative. The District commission does not do anything unless we agree to it with reference to the District celebration. That could not be; there is no thought of a thing of that kind.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I know the gentleman is a practical business man. When we are confronted with a situation in Washington and we believe that the prices are exorbitant, may we go to the gentleman from New York and call his attention to it, and will he help us?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. But perhaps the gentleman from New York would not be able to withstand such a pressure.

Mr. BLOOM. Please give the District commission and the national commission an opportunity to do the things that we would like to do, for which you have not given us sufficient money. This is the only way that we can do it. If we do not do it in this way, we can not do it at all. We are going to protect you and all of the people who come to the District of Columbia, and you can depend upon both of these commissions to do the right thing all around.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] yield to me so that I may ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] a question?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Up to the present moment, no statement has been made publicly or on the floor of the House as to what is the purpose of the gentleman's commission in the way of pageants, and the time of year when they will occur. Can the gentleman give the House some information as to when this big show is to be pulled off?

Mr. BLOOM. I am very glad that the gentleman has asked that question. He wants to know what we are going to do in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the dates when they will occur.

Mr. BLOOM. And all about it. What we are anxious to know is what you are going to do for us. You pass this bill, and within a week or 10 days we will tell you what we are going to do. If you do not pass this bill and give this national commission a chance to operate and cooperate with the District commission, we might not be able to do very much.

Mr. STAFFORD. Assuming we do pass the bill, what does the gentleman purpose doing in the way of pageants, and when—so that the public and the local hotel people may know something about it?

Mr. BLOOM. The first thing we will do, after you pass this bill, will be to call a meeting and decide on the things we would like to do and can do. Every day that you allow time to lapse takes away so much time from the things that we would like to do. We will have to work fast to make the programs that we have in mind. If you will give us an opportunity, by passing this bill, to decide on what we would like to do, then we will bring the program to you.

Mr. STAFFORD. The information the gentleman furnishes is very illuminating.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, every four years when we have inaugurations here there is a system of stands. I have just been informed by one of my colleagues that he brought a party of 16 to Washington one inaugural and had to pay \$7.50 a seat on the stands. It seems to me that that is very much too high a price.

Mr. BLOOM. If things go our way next fall, then the following March we will be willing to pay twice that much on our side. I think that is cheap.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Take a family coming here in a car, wanting to participate in the celebration. If they are confronted with charges for seats at \$2.50 or \$3 or \$4, it is too much.

Mr. BLOOM. That is regulated in different ways. The gentleman to whom the gentleman from New York refers might have paid \$7.50 for a seat at some hotel or upon some private stand. For a window he might have paid \$50. This is entirely different. This corporation will control it. Let us look at this from a business point of view.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But I can not look at a celebration in honor of George Washington from a business point of view. That is my objection to the bill. I would like to have the whole thing thrown open to the public.

Mr. BLOOM. I agree with the gentleman. Why not amend the bill and give the District commission \$150,000 more and give the United States commission \$100,000 more, and we will not charge the public for one thing. We are confronted with a situation now in the United States commission where we are having at the Corcoran Art Gallery the greatest loan exhibit of all of the great pictures from all over the world, and we are giving it free of charge, but we have not money enough to pay for printing the catalogues for this loan exhibition. After we have done this great

work, after we have given the people of this country and of the world, you might say, the greatest pamphlets, the greatest books, the greatest of everything gotten out upon the history of our country, we have to come down to charging 10 or 15 or 25 cents for a little catalogue because you took off \$25,000 when we needed it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Senate took that off.

Mr. BLOOM. The House took it off also. Members of the House have been asking for a sufficient number of portraits of George Washington to send to their constituents and to their lodge rooms. We had to cut our order because you took off \$25,000. Now you are objecting to what we are doing. You are objecting to our selling anything. You want these things, but you do not give us a chance to sell them. Give the District commission some money and they will not charge for anything.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire for information as to the detailed cost for having these pageants during the proper celebration of the bicentennial free to the public, rather than exacting fees to be paid to concessionaires to erect stands along the public highways, or wherever these pageants will be presented.

Mr. BLOOM. I would say that \$100,000 more to the District of Columbia would pay for everything, aside from what they already have.

Mr. STAFFORD. In his previous statement the gentleman supplemented that by saying "and give the commission an additional \$150,000." What would the \$150,000 be for?

Mr. BLOOM. The United States commission?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. I understood the gentleman's preliminary statement to be to that effect. I am seeking to know what it will cost in the District of Columbia to put on a proper show, pageants and the like, without making any charge whatsoever to those who come to the District to see the pageants.

Mr. BLOOM. In my original estimate of what it would cost, we estimated for Mother's Day ten or fifteen thousand dollars; we estimated for ceremonies for the opening of Wakefield about \$10,000, for everything to have a complete celebration. That was completely cut out, so that we have no money for celebrating any special days; that is, the United States commission has no money for that purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am seeking to ascertain what it would cost to put on a proper pageant in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, we must divorce the two. The District is one celebration and the national celebration is another. The gentleman has asked two questions. If the District can be given \$100,000 additional, it can build stands and can give pageants, with our cooperation, and that will pay for everything, and perhaps will leave a little surplus.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then if Congress would be willing to appropriate \$100,000 for an appropriate show for these pageants in the District, would the gentleman then feel the need of having this commission of these distinguished men, or should it be left entirely to the District Commissioners?

Mr. BLOOM. Well, we must remember that this list of names is a list of the District commission. That is where we get this list.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman would still wish to have the District commission incorporated and appropriate \$100,000 for these pageants?

Mr. BLOOM. No. I do not think it would be necessary. If we will appropriate \$100,000, then we do not need this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. But to whom should we appropriate the money? To the District Commissioners?

Mr. BLOOM. To the District commission. You appropriated \$100,000 for the District commission for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington. If you give them another \$100,000, then you will not need this bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How are they expending the \$200,000, generally?

Mr. BLOOM. Well, there will be eight months of celebration. They start to celebrate on February 22, and it will continue up to and including Thanksgiving Day.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to thank the gentleman now for his explicit reply, very much belated, as to when this celebration will be held. The gentleman now says it will continue for eight months, dating from the anniversary of the birth of George Washington.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. TILSON. As a member of the National George Washington Bicentennial Commission, I wish to say a few words in regard to this bill.

I hope the Members of the House will distinguish clearly between the bicentennial celebration as a national affair and the bicentennial celebration in the District of Columbia. The national commission was appointed some seven years ago, and for several years no plan was arrived at. Finally, after about five years of incubation, the plan came forth, which, in brief, is to have the celebration by the people and among the people themselves in the 48 States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories. The idea of attempting to fittingly celebrate such an event by one single celebration, here in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, did not commend itself to our commission. Such a celebration only a comparatively few people could attend. We finally decided that it would be better to call upon all the American people everywhere—in States, cities, towns, and hamlets—to join in arranging local celebrations appropriate and befitting this greatest figure in our national life. Under a somewhat meager appropriation by Congress, we undertook to cooperate with the States, municipalities, and other organizations by supplying literature and other material, but our chief concern has been to secure the cooperation of the people themselves to properly celebrate the bicentennial of George Washington's birth. For the last two years the commission has been pushing this idea.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and Col. U. S. Grant, 3d, were selected as directors to carry out the idea of the commission and to get it out to the whole country. Please observe that the plan did not contemplate a single celebration here in Washington, but a number of celebrations in every State of the Union, in every city, town, and hamlet all over the country. The commission, through the efforts of the directors, has gotten in touch with every State, every city, every governor, mayor, selectman, even down to the smallest hamlet, urging them to appropriately celebrate this bicentennial.

Some States have appropriated considerable sums of money. The gentleman's State of New York has appropriated quite a sum for the celebration of this great event. The District of Columbia occupies, in this respect, the same position as an individual State. A commission was appointed here in the District to arrange for a fitting celebration of the event here in the city bearing Washington's name. The commission has gone forward with the work satisfactorily. Congress was asked to appropriate, and did appropriate, from District funds for this District celebration a certain sum. The sum appropriated was in no wise adequate for the magnitude of the celebration very properly desired by the people of Washington. The sum is not sufficient, and, for one, I think it should not be sufficient to put on a celebration such as should be held in the District of Columbia. I think it is perfectly proper in order to put on pageants or other appropriate festivities to erect temporary stands and to charge admission, if it is all properly regulated, as it will be. It is not only perfectly proper but the people who have the privilege of enjoying it will be delighted to pay for this celebration. To carry out the purposes I have indicated is all this corporation is asked for.

Certain public-spirited men and women in this District by asking for this corporation in effect have said, "If you will incorporate us into a legal corporation, so that we may not, by some untoward accident for which we are not to blame, endanger our private fortunes, we stand ready to

shoulder the burden of this particular community in sponsoring a celebration worthy the name of Washington."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Then the interest of the Bicentennial Commission in this bill is exactly what it would be with regard to any city in the country, or the celebration in any city?

Mr. TILSON. Just the same as in a city of the gentleman's State, as far as the national commission is concerned.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The passage of this bill in no wise has any bearing on the Bicentennial Commission, its activities, or the performance of its duties.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman understands, of course, that we are cooperating with every State so far as they will cooperate with us, and especially so with the District, being located in the same place. Therefore it may be that we are cooperating possibly to a somewhat greater degree in the District because we are able to do so by reason of our proximity.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Just how does the passage of this bill contribute to the activities of the commission in any way?

Mr. TILSON. Not to the national commission at all. It will, however, contribute very materially to the District of Columbia celebration, in which the national commission is, of course, very much interested.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But nothing to the national commission?

Mr. TILSON. This bill is not intended to affect the national commission in any way. It seems to me the bill is perfectly plain. It is a business proposition. All that these people wish is to be legally incorporated. If Members will read the list of the proposed incorporators they will find that they are not the kind of people who would be interested in an undertaking of this character by reason of the hope of private gain. There is no danger of any abuse here.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. MAY. The only purpose of this bill, as I gather from the gentleman's explanation, is to exempt the men who are promoting this thing in the District of Columbia from actions for damages resulting from any accident that might happen.

Mr. TILSON. One purpose is to exempt them from personal actions for damages resulting from accidents for which they are in no wise to blame. It is also to permit them to act as an entity, as a legal corporation, rather than as a partnership or voluntary association of some sort.

Mr. MAY. Or as individuals?

Mr. TILSON. Or as individuals. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BLOOM. May I add this: The District commission is in the same position as the national commission. They can not buy or sell anything. If we wanted to do so, we could not charge an admission fee to anything that may be carried on. If we did so, it would go back to the Treasury, anyway, and that is something they can not do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, to my mind this bill has been well discussed by the Members of the House, and I now move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5341) was laid on the table.

PROTECTION OF UNION LABELS AND SIMILAR INSIGNIA IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2173) to authorize associations of employees in the District of Columbia to adopt a device to designate the products of the

labor of their members, to punish illegal use or imitation of such device, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2173, with Mr. JONES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five minutes. This is a bill to authorize associations in the District of Columbia, particularly the union organizations in the District of Columbia, to adopt some emblem or some mark of designation. It seems they are having some trouble in the District. It seems they are unable to obtain some sort of insignia whereby they can be recognized. The purpose of this bill is to give them recognition and to punish anyone who illegally uses the same or makes an imitation of the same. That is the purpose of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN].

Mr. HARLAN. The President of the United States has recently announced a national program to urge our citizens to cease hoarding money and renew their custom of depositing in banks. A number of prominent spokesmen for the administration have, in addition, very loudly advocated a reduction in the wages of Federal employees in order to reduce the deficit.

Apologizing of these two latest administration methods of restoring prosperity, there appeared in the February 3 issue of Standard Trade and Securities a table showing the liquidity of New York and country banks. There also has appeared in the Wall Street Journal under date of February 4 a statement that the receiver, assistant receiver, and the attorney for the receiver of the Wabash Railroad have agreed to a 10 per cent cut in income. These two items apparently have little connection, but I shall attempt to show that they do demonstrate the utter futility of the Hoover antihoarding program and bear very strongly on the injustice of drastic reductions in Federal employees' wages at the present time.

When the depression started our Executive called together the industrial leaders in this country and urged them (at least in the newspapers) to maintain the former wage scale. The next item of interest appearing in the newspapers was a series of drastic wage reductions all over the country, and included in those reductions were a number of companies having contracts with the Government of the United States. The program of the President to urge people to bring their money back into banks where their accounts are in no way insured will be just as futile as his advertised program to maintain wages above their economic justification.

Speaking of this program to prevent hoarding, by which all of the luncheon clubs and all the oratorical boys in the different communities are going to urge the people to bring their money out and place it on deposit, I see in this publication of Standard Securities a report for the month of December to the effect that the New York banks are now practically 61 per cent liquid, and the country banks are substantially 45 per cent liquid.

The thing that this impresses upon my mind is this. How can we go before the people of this country, Mr. Common Man or the average citizen, and urge him to deposit his money in the banks in order to get it into circulation, when the banks themselves, or at least some of them, are hoarding more than any other institution? The First National, for instance, owns quick assets consisting of cash, governmental, State, and New York bonds and some demand notes of 123 per cent of their deposits. Not much in industrial circulation there!

I am not blaming them for this. This is sane business. It is the proper thing to do, probably, at this time. They do not risk turning their funds into circulation unless they are secured. The Federal Government does not deposit or put

out a single cent in a depository that is not secured. There is not a State or county or school board in this country that deposits money any place without being secured, and yet we are starting a campaign to urge the private citizen, against all of his own common sense, to take his money out of the sock and place it in the bank for the use of other people.

I have also received to-day a letter from a clearing house in my district urging that the amount of money in postal savings accounts be not increased, in order to compel depositors to place their savings in the bank.

This is very commendable, in purpose, but why should we take any action to prevent the laborer or the wage earner from taking the same steps to protect himself that the Government and the banks and all public institutions and departments of our Government take to protect themselves? The gist of the whole proposition is that the people are demanding that they have some security, the same as the Government, and I submit they are entitled to such security. You may talk to them until you are blue in the face, but you will not persuade them to deposit their money in the banks unless you let them know that they have security back of such deposits.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARLAN. The thing that the people of the United States are asking is that their deposits in the banks be secured, and it is nothing more than fair. We do not ask a soldier to go on the field of battle, or at least we did not in the last war, without securing his dependents from suffering all of the loss from his death or injury. There are few, if any, States that do not secure the industrial employee so that he does not have to suffer all of the loss from industrial accident. Why should we compel a depositor, just because he happens to place his money in one bank that may appear as good as another, to suffer a disproportionate loss of his funds from the failure of such bank? There is no reason back of it.

It has been said that there has been lost but little more than 2 per cent of all the money on deposit in the banks in this country during this depression. Think what an infinitesimally small annual premium would secure these bank accounts. There is no reason why we should not do this, and if we do, we can get the money in the banks without having to do all this campaigning to persuade a man to do something that his common sense tells him he should not do.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARLAN. Certainly.

Mr. GLOVER. Is it the gentleman's opinion that if we have a national-bank guarantee law, where the money that is placed in the banks on deposit is absolutely guaranteed, this money that is hidden away now and that the President is talking about would be back in the banks and back in circulation in a very short time?

Mr. HARLAN. I certainly do, and I further believe, Mr. Chairman, if we had such a law as that we would not have to be incorporating a refinance corporation at this time, because the ultimate result of this Refinance Corporation does nothing but give the depositor the security he is seeking. He takes the money out of the garret and buys the bonds and the Government gives him the security he wants, and then the money is turned around and deposited back in the bank and, in the meantime, the small depositor has received his security.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HARLAN. Certainly.

Mr. KETCHAM. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement and it seems to me it covers the case very adequately, except, possibly, in the case of the State banks. What suggestion would the gentleman have in order that State banks may have the same opportunity that the national banks would have under this procedure?

Mr. HARLAN. I should say practically the same protection that we place around State banks going into the reserve system.

Mr. KETCHAM. Then, if the gentleman please, that would necessarily require that every State bank should become identified with the Federal reserve system, and not all of them have so become identified.

Mr. HARLAN. It would simply be up to the bank that is seeking deposits. If they want the benefit of this or if they want the confidence that would be entailed, they can take advantage of this membership. If they do not, they can let it alone; but they will not be banks very long.

Mr. KETCHAM. From what the gentleman says, he can see no practical difficulty in this matter in arranging for State banks to have the same privilege as the national banks, provided they come under the Federal reserve system.

Mr. HARLAN. Absolutely not. We must avert the danger of the Government going into the banking business on the one hand, and the danger of wild-cat and reckless banking on the other by a system of semiweekly reports to the Federal reserve bank authorities showing the outstanding loans, the securities therefor, and extent of renewals, thus affording a proper observation on the insured banks. When the loans are not properly secured, the bank's credit becomes impaired—very much like our insurance companies. The reserve bank could then step in and supervise the credit. But as long as these insured banks are not impaired they could proceed, as they are doing now, with little or no interference.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I should like to say to the gentleman from Maryland that I am being subjected to a few more questions than I expected, and I wondered if he would give me some more time.

Mr. PALMISANO. I suppose so.

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. GLOVER. With reference to the State banks, if we had a national bank guarantee law, does not the gentleman believe that the States would follow with a State guarantee law?

Mr. HARLAN. In answer to the gentleman's question, I believe that might be so; but our experience is the State guarantee laws have not been of the best and pursuing that line is a little difficult, at all events. In this body we are only concerned with Federal questions.

Turning for a moment to the question of wage reductions of Federal employees, in the copy of the Wall Street Journal which I have here is a notice to the effect that the receivers of the Wabash Railroad Co. have applied to our Refinance Corporation for a loan of \$15,000,000. As a special concession for obtaining the \$15,000,000, the receiver, who is now getting \$40,000 a year, his assistant receiver, now receiving \$20,000 a year, and the attorney for the receiver, who gets \$25,000 a year, have generously offered to accept a 10 per cent cut in wages.

The Wabash Railroad is now in the hands of receivers. About two weeks ago it was announced that they were about to pass a dividend, but I do not know whether that has been done or not.

These officials and those of banks and other public-service and financial institutions are just as much public servants and public conservators as the officials in the Federal employ.

I submit that if the officers and high-bracket employees of these different institutions do not accept a substantial wage reduction, they are not entitled to the aid from our Refinance Corporation; and if the governors of our Refinance Corporation extend aid without cutting pay rolls to the bone, those governors are not performing their duties. We can effect a greater saving and benefit to the taxpayers and the wage earners of this country by that means than we can in the reduction of Federal employees' wages, because we will hasten public confidence in our banks and we will reduce the waste in governmental aid.

I do not wish to assume the rôle of demagogue, disparaging men receiving high salaries, because that would be absurd; but in time of prosperity when they were making money there was an excuse for paying salaries commensu-

rate with the abilities required. Now, however, we are in a drastic situation. The Federal Government is doing things hardly justified in any government, in practically going into the banking business, and it would clearly seem reasonable that before any aid is extended by this institution which we have incorporated and given \$2,000,000, without any supervision at all, the board of governors should see to it that the high-salaried men in banks and railroads have their salaries reduced not 10 per cent but to a mark that would really mean something during the period of Federal aid.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSS. Can the gentleman tell us who fixed the salaries of the receivers, the assistant receivers, and the attorneys?

Mr. HARLAN. The salaries in the Wabash Railroad case, of course, were fixed by the court.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman referred to high-salaried men in banks who have the required ability. By that he does not mean that all of these bank presidents have the required ability?

Mr. HARLAN. Possibly not; but they require ability now.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But a great many of them have not the required ability.

Mr. HARLAN. They have not exhibited it, at least.

I have supported every one of the financial measures proposed by the administration, because I feel that they can do little harm and may do some good. I regret very much that they were not put in force at least eight months prior to their actual enactment so that we might have attempted to save many of the banks that have failed and many of the foreclosures that have occurred during that time. However, I do not believe that there is any economist who believes that they are in any way a permanent remedy for our present economic ills. These can only be cured with the revival of international trade, and that trade is almost hopelessly strangled by our present network of retaliatory tariffs.

We must, furthermore, establish permanent confidence in our financial institutions by distributing the burden of bank failures. People demand, and justly demand, security for the money which they turn over to others for administration. Should prosperity return, the deposits will no doubt return to the banks, but when the first clouds appear on the horizon the people will follow their instinct of self-preservation and begin to hoard.

The third step for the achievement of something like permanent prosperity in this country is the abolition of the perfectly absurd and ridiculous burden which we are now bearing to procure a travesty on law enforcement. The people may either be right or wrong in their attitude toward Puritanical laws and hoarding, but right or wrong, they are going to follow their own convictions; and, in the meantime it is up to the Government of the United States to respect the convictions of a majority of its people.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the press to-day reports that our Republican friends are rejoicing because of an interpretation they have put upon the statement of a leading citizen of the State of New York. It is said they now expect him to be the Democratic nominee in the coming election.

Mr. FOSS. For what office?

Mr. BLANTON. For the high office of President of the United States. I am merely one humble Democrat, but I represent a district of Democrats, who have been Democrats practically all of their lives. They have never gotten off the reservation except once, and that was when this same distinguished gentleman was in 1928 at the head of our ticket. Let me call attention to exactly what Gov. Alfred E. Smith said in his press statement to-day, and if you Republican brethren will listen I do not think that you will get much comfort out of it. He said:

If the Democratic national convention, after careful consideration, should decide that it wants me to lead, I will make the fight.

In my judgment, that puts him out of the running before things get started, because, if the opinion of a humble Democrat may be accepted, the convention will not have to wait for careful consideration, because Governor Smith will not be seriously considered again, and he is already eliminated.

I was one of those who faithfully and loyally supported my ticket in 1928. For many years I have fought uncompromisingly the main thing that Governor Smith espoused. I put aside my own feelings in the matter. I felt that the Democratic Party meant more to the people and was bigger than any man that ever appeared on its ticket.

I supported my ticket. I supported it at a great personal sacrifice. I supported it faithfully and honestly, because I knew that the party was a great party, and every Democrat who supported that ticket did it at a personal sacrifice, I do not care how he stood on public questions. He made a personal sacrifice that meant much to him. Many of them made sacrifices that swept them out of office, and many of them made sacrifices in 1928 that may yet sweep them out of public office, because the public when it goes into the little booth to mark its ballot, goes in there to speak its own private personal sentiments, and the people were uncompromisingly against some of the things that the head of our ticket stood for.

I am one of those who rejoices in the fact that Governor Smith has been a big enough man not to inject himself into this campaign. He has not done it yet, and I do not believe he will do it. I believe that he will be faithful and loyal enough to the best interests of our party, and to the personal interests of the members of the Democratic Party, who signally honored him in 1928 with their greatest gift, to keep out of it; and I believe that those friends of ours in New York who have been his ardent supporters and have made sacrifices for him, and who appreciate the sacrifices all other Democrats have made for him, will applaud him for keeping out of it, because things are ripe now for a great Democratic victory in November if we will just keep all highly controversial matters out of our party.

Mr. MAY. But suppose we nominate JOHN GARNER, of Texas; we will sure win, will we not?

Mr. BLANTON. JOHN GARNER would sweep the country as sure as we live. For he has the absolute confidence of the people everywhere. There is no man who can touch him anywhere in the United States as a leader of men on public questions. He has led the opposition here across the aisle so many times and made them follow him so many times that he has demonstrated to the business interests of the country that he is the best and safest leader in the whole United States.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will not the gentleman give the progressives a little credit for that?

Mr. BLANTON. If he were nominated, he would carry every progressive in the United States. Because he thinks of, with, and for the common people. We would find the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] on the stump making his unanswerable speeches for JOHN GARNER in the interest of the public, if such a nomination were made. But I have no right to speak for our distinguished leader. Until he permits us to present him, we must hold our inclinations in abeyance. He knows more about politics and more about Government business and problems and all other things than the rest of us will know in many years. He is the popular choice of the people now, and if we could only persuade him to run, he would sweep the country. I have no right to speak for him, but I am saying to my Republican brethren that they better quit rejoicing, because they will not have Al Smith on the ticket.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement. I am wondering, in view of his statement, if Al Smith should be the candidate on the Democratic ticket, whether the gentleman would support him as he did before?

Mr. BLANTON. I am always frank. I always support my Democratic ticket as long as I am a Democrat. But what the gentleman from Michigan suggests as a possibility is hardly conceivable, for Governor Smith is a loyal Democrat, and he knows that his nomination would disrupt Democrats everywhere, and absolutely ruin all chances of success for his Democratic Party.

You will find me fighting for Democratic principles and for our ticket no matter who is on it. I believe in the Democratic Party. It is the party of the people. From its very beginning, it has been against special privileges to classes. It stands for equal opportunity to all. The gentleman's party has stood always for special privilege to classes. It is the party of special privileges. My party has stood for the people, and I am loyally for it; but I want to say that the Democrats of this country are going into that convention shoulder to shoulder making a fight that will win to get this country back in good condition, and the business men of the country are going to be behind us. The business men of the country have watched our distinguished leader in this House, and he has gained their confidence. They are back of him and they will support him without hesitation. They want normal times again.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I have always thought the gentleman was a great believer in principle, and I know he has been. He has been a great believer for the things which he thought were right. In view of the statement the gentleman has just made, assuming that the gentleman's party should nominate a man who fundamentally disagreed with the principles of the gentleman, would the gentleman still vote for him, as he stated, simply because he is a Democrat?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to my friend from Michigan that every single plank in the platform of the Democratic Party is a plank of principles, and high principles. It always has been. There are so many fine planks, all planks of principle, that any Democrat can support the Democratic platform no matter who the candidates are who may head the ticket. [Laughter.] You can always do that. The gentleman from Michigan, who thinks just as I do on a few fundamental questions, and who stands for principle as I do, if he could get a man who was just a little wetter than wet Mr. Hoover, he would still support him. What is the difference between Al Smith and Mr. Hoover? Al Smith is frank. He comes out and says, "I am wet." Mr. Hoover says nothing, and is a wet nevertheless. I do not know whether the gentleman has seen the advance edition of the fake so-called Times Herald of February 30 or not that came to our offices to-day, but he will find that his champion flag bearer is heralded abroad in advance as the wet advocate of repeal.

I just want to say in conclusion that while I loyally supported my ticket in 1928, I am unalterably opposed to Gov. Alfred E. Smith heading our ticket again this year. And as one Democrat I want him to know that the people in my district who supported him in 1928 are now 90 per cent against him, and it is not a question of Catholicism either, and we commend him for not being a candidate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas two additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. HOWARD. I received a very interesting letter this morning from a cornfield constituent, and I am sure it would be interesting to the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman has been discussing candidates. This man who wrote me says that the Republic now has only three white hopes, and he names them in order: Garner, Roosevelt, and Rainey. Does the gentleman from Texas pin his hope to one of those three?

Mr. BLANTON. I am for all of them. I am for every good Democrat, and the gentleman has mentioned three very good ones. I am for every one of them. [Applause]

and laughter.] I wish all three of them could be candidates. Does that answer the gentleman?

Mr. HOWARD. Well, that is about as good as I expected. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the gentleman how he stands on that question?

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, how he stands? As early as July the gentleman from Nebraska publicly proclaimed not only his support of Franklin D. Roosevelt but he made a prophecy, and his prophecies always come true, that Roosevelt would be the next President of the United States in spite of the international bankers and the Power Trust. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. I believe we will have two on the ticket whom the gentleman from Nebraska can follow without any trouble at all, and they will be eminent statesmen I am going to follow. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia].

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I did not want to enter into a discussion with the gentleman from Texas, but now that he has made the nominations for the National Democratic Party, I do not believe I will be consulted in that any more than I will be consulted in the National Republican Convention. But when the gentleman raises a question as to planks and principles and raises the question of how wet Mr. Hoover may be or how wet Mr. Smith is, then, of course, I think the suggestion requires an answer. I do not believe that Al Smith lost votes in the gentleman's State because of liquor. I think it was more a question of water, the kind of water contained in the fount when he was baptized.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. This is the first time in its history that my State ever went Republican and it is the first time in history that my district ever went Republican, and it went for Mr. Hoover by 11,000 votes. That does not mean that they are not Democrats, but that the people refused to endorse his proposed repeal of the eighteenth amendment. It was not because of Catholicism either. What did Baltimore do, the Catholic hub of the Nation? Even Baltimore went against Governor Smith. Many of the Catholics in my State voted against him.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I will say to the gentleman that his platform, in all likelihood, will have a wet plank in it.

Mr. BLANTON. If it does it will be over my objection. If it does it will beat the Democratic Party worse than we have ever been beaten before.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I now say that if my party has not got a wet plank in it I will not support it. Will the gentleman say as much on the reverse side?

Mr. BLANTON. I will say I am going to do everything in my power to keep a wet plank out of our Democratic platform. I will promise the gentleman that.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But if a wet plank goes in, what then?

Mr. BLANTON. I am still a Democrat. [Laughter and applause.] But God forbid that such a calamity should happen. It would cause millions of Democrats everywhere to refuse to support their ticket.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there are so many important issues that the people of this country must decide that they refuse to be separated on the wet and dry question. If prohibition had been a success, and if you had prohibition in this country to-day, it would not be an issue and we would not be talking about liquor in the face of important economic problems to solve; but in the absence of enforcement, after 11 years of complete failure, after spending millions and millions of dollars in attempted enforcement, then I say the people of this country, whether Republicans or Democrats, are not going to permit politicians to play with this question any longer, and they will demand a clear-cut declaration from both of the great parties.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I can not yield now.

Reference was made to-day to a publication that is being distributed. Let me say that that publication comes from a group of stand-pat, black Republicans, and the next thing to follow will be a declaration on the part of the contributors to the Republican campaign fund that unless the Republican Party takes a decided stand on prohibition and puts a real, honest wet plank in their platform there will be no contributions to the Republican campaign fund.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I can not yield now.

Mr. BLANTON. Then if it does that your Republican Party is doomed.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I want to say that this question, this great moral issue will never be decided until the great parties take a stand on it. If one party takes the wet side and the other party takes the dry side then men of free will will vote according to their convictions and not according to a party label. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the great questions which we are talking about, that will be an issue in the next campaign, I want to call your attention to one that will be an outstanding and vital one this summer and fall, in case conditions do not change, and that is the unemployment problem.

A little more than two years ago we were told by prophets that the unemployment situation was on a distinct upturn, that in a few days, or 60 days, or such a matter, the country would be back to normal. We were also told that the big industries were not going to reduce wages but were going to continue under the conditions which were in existence in October, 1929. Time and again we have heard those pronouncements and similar ones since then, yet to-day we are facing the fact, according to the latest statistics, that between seven and ten million men are out of employment, men who have no employment at all, and in addition we have another large group—no one seems to know how many—who are on part-time employment.

During this session of Congress we have passed several measures which we were told were going to relieve the country of present conditions. We see those measures getting under way, yet more and more disappointment comes to us and we begin to question how much value these measures will be.

These other questions are important and I am interested in them and their solution, but I want to say in my judgment we do have one great question in this country, one outstanding question, and one that any candidate for President or any other office in this country should think about and to which he should give serious thought, and that is the solving of the problem of unemployment. If we could solve the problem of unemployment and get our people at work that would go a long way toward solving the great questions which face this country at this time.

Just think of the great farm problem in the country. Why is not the farmer able to sell his produce? For the simple reason that the man who needs it does not have income enough to purchase it. There is hardly any other thing which you can mention but what unemployment is fundamentally at the basis of the evil.

I agree with the President, who was then Candidate Hoover, when he said in his Newark speech, September 17, 1928:

The problem of insuring full-time work all the time is a problem of national concern.

And again in same speech—

It is one which government only contributes to solve.

Here he takes the position that the Government has a definite responsibility. I believe that we, in response to that belief, should act immediately to carry out that responsibility. In an emergency like this we should act at once to relieve the situation, and then we should act to bring about permanent legislation so that this will not occur again.

One of the causes of the farmers' condition is the lack of income among the masses. We must act. The farmer's problem is just one big problem, but there are others caused by this unemployment, and to get out of the morass we must remove the causes which contribute to make conditions as they exist in this country to-day. For instance, you take the post offices. In practically all of the post offices the receipts are being reduced so that they are being taken from one class and put in a lower class. All of this causes more and more unemployment, and the beginning of it was brought about by unemployment. This is a national question.

We are told that in 1929 the laboring man lost about \$10,000,000,000 of his income and that in 1931 he lost over \$11,000,000,000. No country and no industry in a country where this is true can be prosperous, except those few protected given monopolies to oppress the masses.

In my judgment, you can organize all the corporations you want in order to bolster up big business; you can pass all the tariff legislation you want and build up animosity between our country and foreign countries and compel them to pass retaliatory tariffs; and this will only bring about more and more trouble and will not go to the root of the fundamental evil and solve the great questions which we face.

To-day you can take the prices of the different commodities which the farmer has to sell, and the reason those prices are so low is because the men who need the commodities do not have the income to purchase them. Fundamentally, that is the trouble. The trouble is that the men who need these things—millions of our people in the cities and other places—can not purchase them because they do not have the purchasing power. Those are the questions which are facing us to-day. You can have a conference at the White House every day of the week, and you can make some great pronouncement that you are going to help 20,000,000 people, but unless you put back in the hands of the great masses of the people the purchasing power you can not solve these questions which face this country.

As a Member of this Congress I would like to see something constructive done. Something should be brought about now to restore the purchasing power of our people. The Government can contribute in two ways—by starting a needful system of public works, and then evolve legislation to prevent the recurrence of such a condition.

I know that the Government alone can not take up all the slack in unemployment, but we can help and should help by public works which are needed and economical, as road building and public buildings. All of this will stimulate work and industry and scatter more money among our people, which will increase purchasing power, which is sorely needed at this time, and will benefit business, banking, debtors, and everyone.

Also, there ought to be some permanent legislation whereby we will prevent a recurrence of such a condition.

The administration that is in power now, it seems to me, is going right along just as if this is an evil that has to come to us every so often, and the only thing we can do about it is to blindly go through it, with the hope we will never have such a condition to contend with again or with the hope the time may be prolonged after we do get through with it.

It has been 27 months since the trend started downward, and according to the statistics I do not think anyone has estimated the unemployed in this great country to-day at less than it was at any time previous to this time. In other words, so far as we know, and in spite of all the money that has been appropriated to bolster up big business, we are still on the downward trend, or certainly no signs of an upward trend.

Again, I say, I believe Congress should make some kind of temporary provision to deal with this question immediately and then formulate something of a permanent nature to see that such a condition as this does not come upon us again. For instance, you take this argument that the Government ought to stay out of business is stressed until big business wants the Government in business on its side, and then a demand comes. In my humble judgment the impos-

tency of big business to deal with the situation is stressed in the demand for the Finance Corporation.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PATTERSON. My time is short, but I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. PATMAN. What does the gentleman think about paying off the adjusted-service certificates? That would put \$2,200,000,000 in circulation.

Mr. PATTERSON. I have supported that legislation all the time, and I am in favor of it. I am in favor of anything to increase the income of our people in this country; and, too, I have always voted with the soldier and service man on such legislation, and expect to continue. I believe the Congress and the people ought to formulate some permanent machinery, a national council or something of that sort, to deal with this situation and see that it shall not occur again.

As I have said, big business gets alarmed when we talk about the Government going into business or seeing after the masses of the people. I do not believe that the Government should go into business on the side of any special group, but government should see that all have an equal chance, and that is not the case now. Big business has never shown its impotency more than it has this year and the past two to handle such a situation. During all this time big business has not offered one constructive measure to bring us out of this period of depression, and they came at the beginning of the Congress appealing to the country and to the Congress to help them bolster up their bonds and their finances.

We can not get out of the depression in that way. I introduced some bills providing for public works at the opening of the present Congress, and I am introducing another one this afternoon. I believe we ought to take action along this line as a temporary measure and then begin now to formulate a policy or program to see that such a thing does not happen in the future.

I do not believe it is consistent with Americanism to see our people in this situation. I do not believe in the doctrine of overproduction that we have heard preached so much. We need only to point to the millions who are hungry and poorly clothed to see that it is not a question of overproduction, but is a question of underconsumption.

The great question before us to-day is to restore the purchasing power of our people, and to do this we have come to the place where we should start public works. I regret that we have come to this place by the impotency of those who could have saved us and whose responsibility it was to deal with the matter. I for one believe we should meet it courageously and promptly, and I am ready. [Applause.]

The laboring man is one of our bulwarks of safety in the Republic and when he has the income he never goes on a strike. He always does his part in the purchasing world. If you make the laboring man and farmer prosperous, you always have a prosperous country. If we could to-day restore the loss of wage to our people who work and the income of the person who gets a salary, the goods on the shelves will begin to move at once and the farmer can begin to sell more of his product at a living wage. The person who works to-day, whether he draws a wage or a moderate salary, his interest is directly woven and interwoven with the small business man and the farmer and there is no prospering of one without the other, and the business man's business is founded on the well-being of both groups. Put the farmer and those who work so that they will get their share of the national income and we all prosper, and not until then.

In my judgment, this whole catastrophe could have been averted had there been a better division of income among the masses of people who work in whatever line they may. In other words, capital had appropriated almost all of the benefits of science, invention, and improved machinery, and consequently we had stagnation. To illustrate, in 1899 wages were nearly 25 per cent of commodities manufactured and in 1929 only a little more than 16½ per cent.

We are told that from 1920 to 1929 the returns to the capitalist increased 72 per cent, while the returns to labor increased only 13 per cent, and the returns in dividends increased 285 per cent. And again the millionaire classes increased by more than 600 per cent. These conditions bring to our mind more and more the importance of remedying these abuses and the suffering with which we are afflicted to-day. While all these conditions of concentration of wealth were going on into the hands of the few and the laboring man's income was being curtailed in proportion to the income of the coupon clippers and international bankers and promoters, we find the farmer's income going down until to-day the farmer has come to an impossible condition, and we must act on his behalf, and in my judgment if we will give him equal opportunities and remove the discriminations, which is all he asks, he will come again, even though he is now pressed down lower than at any previous time. One step in this program is to restore the purchasing power of our people by giving them an opportunity to work and earn.

We must also lighten the burden of taxation on the farmer and working man, and lighten the burden of debt. These three things can be done and must be done to save America. We should this day pledge ourselves to a solution of these and act now with wisdom and courage in the interest of the great masses of our people.

I introduced on the opening of Congress some bills to help do this and am introducing another to-day which I believe will help alleviate the present crisis in which we find ourselves and do it speedily if enacted into law.

Then I am introducing a bill soon which I believe contains the principle which will prevent a recurrence of these terrible conditions.

I hope this Congress and the administration can and will join nonpartisanly in a program like this and relieve the downtrodden of our country in every walk of life, reaching out on the small farms the working people, the professional and small business people, and then we shall see real prosperity. And if we will to-day enter solemnly on this duty, we can do it, and in this outstanding accomplishment of the century there would be glory enough for all, and our beloved country will return to its ancient ideals, and there will be a reign of prosperity, peace, and happiness through our land that will be reflected in all the world. This is our challenge; this is our opportunity. May we be given wisdom and faith to guide us and courage to sustain us through this trying hour that we may bring our beloved country to its high estate. [Applause.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, several days ago in another body Dr. Arthur Dean Bevan made the statement before a certain committee that 90 per cent of the doctors of this country are bootleggers. I rise to deny this charge and to read a telegram from a very distinguished member of the medical profession in my home city, Norfolk, Va.:

NORFOLK, VA., February 4, 1932.

HON. MENALCUS LANKFORD,

House of Representatives:

In response to accusation by Doctor Bevan that doctors were bootleggers, I know of very few who even charge for prescriptions. For 10 years I have prescribed without making the first charge. The Government is allowing such inferior liquor to be put out that one can hardly give it away. It is a crime when liquor is badly needed to use such stuff on humans. The graft is in the liquor, not the doctor. Out of justice, please read on the floor.

DR. JOHN W. WINSTON.

I may say in conclusion that I regard this statement of Doctor Bevan as a slander upon the honorable medical profession, not only of my own city but throughout the country. [Applause.]

The Clerk, reading the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 2. No person shall in any way use or display the label, brand, mark, name, or other character adopted by any such union or association as provided in section 1 of this act without the consent or authority of such union or association; or counterfeit or imitate any such label, brand, mark, name, or other character,

or knowingly sell, dispose of, keep, or have in his possession with intent to sell or dispose of any goods, wares, merchandise, or other products of labor upon which any such counterfeit or imitation is attached, affixed, printed, stamped, or impressed, or knowingly sell, dispose of, keep, or have in his possession with intent to sell or dispose of any goods, wares, merchandise, or other products of labor contained in any box, case, can, or package to which or on which any such counterfeit or imitation is attached, affixed, printed, painted, stamped, or impressed. If copies of such device have been filed, the union or association may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia to enjoin the manufacture, use, display, or sale of counterfeit or colorable imitations of such device, or of goods bearing the same, or the unauthorized use or display of such device or of goods bearing the same, and the court may restrain such wrongful manufacture, use, display, or sale, and every unauthorized use or display by others of the genuine devices so registered and filed if such use or display is not authorized by the owner thereof, and may award to the plaintiff such damages resulting from such wrongful manufacture, use, display, or sale as may be proved, together with the profits derived therefrom.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 3, strike out the words "may restrain such wrongful manufacture, use, display, or sale."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to deny the allegation made by my good friend from New York, Mr. LaGUARDIA, that the prohibition law is a failure. How many persons has he seen around the Capitol this morning or to-day under the influence of liquor? Not one.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Nor before prohibition either.

Mr. BLANTON. How many persons has he seen in Washington to-day under the influence of liquor? Not one.

I want to say this to my colleague—I have been here some time; not as long as some, but a pretty good time—I now have to wear glasses, and my hair is turning a little gray since I have been here, but not since January 16, 1920, have I seen a Member of Congress take one drink, not one; 435 Congressmen and 96 Senators. Since the law went into effect I have not seen one Member on either side of the Capitol take a drink; not one. Of course, some may drink, but not here. You tell me that prohibition is not a success. Before that time we had several hundred saloons in Washington, and one right under this House Chamber in the Capitol. Yet you say it is not a success. National prohibition is a success.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The legislation then was just as good as it is now.

Mr. BLANTON. When prohibition was passed there were 300 saloons in this city operating all the time. Just a few years before when the Jones law was passed there were 600 saloons in Washington, and you could not go down town without passing one on every corner. They violated the law every day. When States passed a law against selling to minors, the saloons sold to minors just the same. When States passed a law that they should not sell to drunkards, saloons sold to drunkards just the same. When States passed a law that they should close their doors at a certain hour, they did close their front doors but they sold on behind closed doors until daylight, and that was worse than if they had kept their front doors open.

I want to say that conditions have improved, and you now find thousands of men in every city who on Saturday night go home with their full pay check and give it to their wives for the benefit of their families, whereas they used to waste it in saloons and never take it home. You find them sober back at work Monday morning.

Where is the man who says that it is not a success? Wet politicians only say it. I have watched the attempts for the last week that have been made to hamstring the Attorney General of the United States, to hamstring Colonel Woodcock, the head of the prohibition force, with every kind of a question on earth, attempting to retard their work and keep them from doing their duty. I want to say it is time for men here to support and defend the Constitution, to get up and defend it when it is attacked. I am going to defend it every time it is attacked. [Applause.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Texas has told the people that all of the 435 Members here are law-abiding citizens.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not say that some of them may not take a drink. But I do say that I have not seen any Member take a drink since January 16, 1920, when prohibition went into effect.

I went to a banquet last Saturday night, one of the finest banquets I ever attended. There were nearly a thousand of splendid citizens of this great city around the festive board. I never saw a drink taken or a single violation of law at that big banquet. These Washingtonians were all high-class men who believe in respecting and upholding the law. While some of them may drink, they do not violate the law by publicly drinking in this city, and I take my hat off to them as splendid citizens who believe in law and order. [Applause.]

Mr. PALMISANO. I call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to the fact that in my maiden speech here in 1927 I requested the gentleman to offer an amendment to strike out section 29 of the Volstead Act and provide that Members of Congress and of the judiciary and the district attorneys who are convicted or acquiesce in violation of the law should be impeached. The gentleman has not introduced that amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I have introduced House Joint Resolution 83 and have it right here to do that very thing. It is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary, and I want the gentleman from Maryland to help me pass it. My Joint Resolution No. 83 provides that it shall be cause for impeachment and removal from office and dishonorable discharge from the service and discharge from Government employment, respectively, for any executive officer, member of the judiciary, Senator, Representative in Congress, officer or enlisted man in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, or any employee of the Government of the United States, to purchase intoxicating liquors from a "bootlegger," as that term is commonly understood, or to manufacture, sell, or transport intoxicating liquors within, or to import the same into, the United States for beverage purposes, or to conspire with any person to violate the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and laws passed in enforcement thereof. I invite all of my colleagues to read this House Joint Resolution 83 in full. They will find it strong enough to meet all objections. It calls attention to the fact that all of the above have taken a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States and that they should keep their oath or quit drawing a Government salary.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I am sure that every colleague of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] will agree with him sympathetically in his efforts to defend the Constitution of the United States, but defending the Constitution of the United States by denying existing facts does not help very much. What the gentleman says about the saloons in the District of Columbia in preprohibition days is quite true. Now, instead of having the saloons, we have the speak-easies. The gentleman remembers it was not very long ago when he himself was shocked by the revolting conditions exposed by certain newspapermen here showing the flagrant violations of the prohibition laws in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. And that is the reason I say that Mr. Hoover is a wet. If he were not, he would not permit such violations of the law to exist, as he is the chief enforcement officer of the Nation, and the duty rests upon his shoulders to enforce all laws.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And I saw the gentleman from Texas as a lone hand force a commissioner out because he was not obeying the law.

Mr. BLANTON. But it had to be forced, did it not?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; and the gentleman from Texas is just as helpless in attempting to enforce prohibition in the District of Columbia as are all the Army and Navy and other forces of the United States Government in trying to enforce it in a land of 120,000,000 people, when a majority of them are rebelling and want to see it repealed.

Mr. BLANTON. At least I am upholding the arms of the enforcement officers and not pulling them down.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman is not upholding the arms of the officers when he takes the floor and denies existing facts and attempts to becloud the issue by saying that the law is enforced in the District of Columbia. I submit to any intelligent, impartial man or woman in the city of Washington who has eyes and knows what is going on whether the law is being enforced in Washington any better than it is enforced in any city in Texas, or in any other city of the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. And how about the shooting of these little girls down here, and the man who was killed on Saturday night. We are having murder in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Absolutely; the gentleman is right; and it is all the result of gin-crazed people, brought about by prohibition. We never had such conditions before prohibition. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, we have had murders and rape and burglaries and robberies and arson and every crime known in the annals of criminology happening regularly in Washington, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Chicago long before we have had prohibition, and when open saloons flourished everywhere. These late crimes were committed doubtless by New York and Chicago gangsters who are absolutely sober.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Absolutely; gangsters, criminals, and racketeers who have made money out of prohibition. Those are the conditions we are seeking to eliminate. When the gentleman from Texas takes the floor in defense of the Constitution, in which we all sympathize, at least he should not deny existing, tangible facts, such as he himself enumerates. This question will never be settled until you take liquor and put it under proper Government regulation. At this very moment, when this Congress is struggling with a deficit of \$2,000,000,000, when we do not know to what sources of revenue we can turn for taxes, we are permitting hundreds of millions of dollars to go into the pockets of outlaws and violators of the law, criminals who sell poisoned hooch, when instead we should be taxing wholesome wine and beer and putting it under proper Government regulation.

Mr. BLANTON. What is proper Government regulation?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It is putting it under license and taxing it and seeing that it is pure and regulating its sale.

Mr. BLANTON. And would they obey that any more than they obey the present Government regulations? If liquorites will not support and obey present Government regulations, they will not obey any others.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Of course. They will be compelled to.

Mr. BLANTON. Who would compel them? Would the gentleman from New York? Then, at least, we would have some help that we have not now. If we can compel them to obey the gentleman's proposed Government regulations, we can equally well compel them to obey the present constitutional Government regulations.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The United States is the only country that has not abandoned prohibition. I repeat—and shouting can not put down existing facts—prohibition is not and can not be enforced. There is just as much consumption of alcohol to-day in the United States as there was 13 years ago, with the difference that a great deal of it is unwholesome, and some of it is poison. It is not taxed; it is not regulated. We have created a criminal class, and conditions are so unbearable that we simply can not continue under the present system brought about by prohibition.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in 1909 the Federal Government alone took in revenue from the basic industry of liquor, beer, and wine, \$483,000,000, which we are losing to-day.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And that does not take into consideration the license fees paid municipalities and the State excise taxes.

Mr. BLANTON. And I call attention to the fact that the organized liquor traffic has cost \$483,000,000,000 in wrecked

lives, wrecked homes, wrecked orphans, and wrecked hopes and wrecked ambitions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, that was a pro forma amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BANKHEAD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2173 and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXEMPTION OF BUILDING AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS FROM BEING ADJUDGED BANKRUPTS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (S. Con. Res. 15), which is on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a Senate concurrent resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 15

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President pro tempore of the Senate in signing the enrolled bill (S. 2199) entitled "An act exempting building and loan associations from being adjudged bankrupts," be rescinded, and that in the reenrollment of the said bill the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to make the following corrections, namely: On page 1 of the engrossed bill, line 8, strike out the comma after the word "except"; on page 1, line 9, insert a comma after the word "association"; and on page 2, line 5, strike out the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the word "or."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mrs. NORTON on account of illness.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSION, GEORGE WASHINGTON BICENTENNIAL

The SPEAKER. The attention of the Chair has been called to the fact that in the passage of the bill (S. 1306) to provide for the incorporation of the District of Columbia Commission, George Washington Bicentennial, some amendments were offered, which will necessitate the change of section numbers. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to change the section numbers accordingly.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], the minority leader, is momentarily absent from the floor, but the gentleman is interested in ascertaining if it is not possible to let the so-called "lame-duck" amendment, which is set for Friday, February 12, go over until next week.

Mr. RAINEY. I would be very glad to do that, but the Committee on Appropriations will have a bill ready on Tues-

day of next week, and we would like to go along with the "lame-duck" resolution. We can postpone a vote on it until Saturday, but that was the day fixed with the consent of everybody on the floor.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I was present, but it has developed that on account of Lincoln's birthday a great many Members desire to be absent on that day and the following day.

Mr. RAINEY. That was developed on the floor at the time the date was fixed and it was switched around and we put the Private Calendar before that, and I think that date ought to stand in view of the condition of the business of the House. Members ought to be able to get back here by Saturday, and we can wait until Saturday for a vote.

Mr. MICHENER. If that is the situation, why can we not proceed now with the Interior Department appropriation bill. The committee is here day after day, ready to call the bill up. The House meets and adjourns to-day at 3.30, and on other occasions in like manner. It seems to me if that is the situation of the calendar and the program, we should not compel many Members to forego commitments which have been made with reference to Lincoln's birthday and the day following.

Mr. RAINEY. But we had that agreement and the Members had an opportunity to object. I think we had better proceed.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, the gentleman has it within his power.

Mr. RAINEY. I would rather not change the program now.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 70. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of county commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to construct a free overhead viaduct across the Mahoning River at Struthers, Mahoning County, Ohio;

H. R. 225. An act providing for payment of \$25 to each enrolled Chippewa Indian of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 474. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.;

H. R. 4695. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Culbertson, Mont.;

H. R. 4696. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River southerly from the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation at or near the point known and designated as the Power-site Crossing, in the State of Montana;

H. R. 5131. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near and above the city of New Orleans, La.;

H. R. 5471. An act authorizing Sullivan County, Ind., to construct, maintain, and operate a public toll bridge across the Wabash River at a point in said county to a point opposite on the Illinois shore;

H. R. 5478. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.;

H. R. 5626. An act authorizing the States of Minnesota and North Dakota, the county of Polk, Minn., the county of Grand Forks, N. Dak., or any one or more of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Red River of the North at or near Bygland, Minn.;

H. R. 5878. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission and the Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., and the Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a combination highway and railroad bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.;

H. R. 6663. An act to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Skull Valley Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7225. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Allegheny County, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River between the city of Pittsburgh and the borough of Homestead, Pa.; and

H. R. 7248. An act authorizing the modification of the existing project for the Willamette River between Oregon City and Portland, Ore.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 201. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of South Carolina to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Waccamaw River;

S. 2278. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to reduce the penalty of the bond of the Brazos River and Harbor Navigation District, of Brazoria County, Tex., furnished as surety for its doing certain work on the improvement of Freeport Harbor, Tex.;

S. 2406. An act for the relief of Harvey K. Meyer, and for other purposes; and

S. 2684. An act for the relief of F. P. Case.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 9, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. RAINEY submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Tuesday, February 9, 1932, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

(10 a. m.)

Philippine independence.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

(10 a. m.)

Trade-marks.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

Interstate commerce act, section 15a—H. R. 7116 and H. R. 7117; recapture clause.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UTILITIES

(10.30 a. m.)

Merger of street railway corporations in the District—H. J. Res. 154.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Marine Corps personnel.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Shipping of armaments—H. J. Res. 270.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PALMISANO: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5321. A bill to amend an act approved February 20, 1896, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved May 11, 1892"; without amendment (Rept. No. 377). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PALMISANO: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5651. A bill to amend chapter 15 of the Code of Law

for the District of Columbia relating to the condemnation of land for public use; with amendment (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. POUL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 133. A resolution providing for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 14; without amendment (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. IGOE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8163. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct a free highway bridge across the Pecatonica River at Harrison, in Winnebago County, State of Illinois; with amendment (Rept. No. 381). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. IGOE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8171. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct a free highway bridge across the Kankakee River at Momence, in Kankakee County, State of Illinois; with amendment (Rept. No. 382). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. IGOE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8236. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to reconstruct a free highway bridge across the Fox River at Geneva, in Kane County, State of Illinois; with amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. IGOE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8237. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct a free highway bridge across the Fox River 5½ miles south of McHenry, in McHenry County, State of Illinois; with amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. IGOE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8238. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free highway bridge across the Fox River at Algonquin, in McHenry County, State of Illinois; with an amendment (Rept. No. 385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8250. A bill granting authority to the Texas State Highway Commission to maintain and operate, as constructed, a free highway bridge across Trinity River between the counties of Navarro and Henderson, in the State of Texas; with an amendment (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. IGOE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8324. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct a free highway bridge across Rock River at Byron, in Ogle County, State of Illinois; with an amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. IGOE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8327. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct a free highway bridge across Rock River at Oregon, in Ogle County, State of Illinois; with an amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2639. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Poplar, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 6659. A bill for the inclusion of certain lands in the Coeur d'Alene and St. Joe National Forests, State of Idaho, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BLACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1226. A bill for the relief of Edna M. Gilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARE: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 2026. A bill for the relief of the legal representatives of Cobb, Blasdel & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5891) for the relief of W. H. Comrie, jr.; Committee on World War Veterans Legislation discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8855) for the relief of Samuel Renville; Committee on Indian Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8856) for the relief of John M. Green; Committee on Indian Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8857) for the relief of Lydia Wakanna; Committee on Indian Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8858) for the relief of George Henry; Committee on Indian Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8859) for the relief of Joseph Redwing; Committee on Indian Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8860) for the relief of Abraham Redwing; Committee on Indian Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8861) for the relief of Ray Whipple; Committee on Indian Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8862) for the relief of Delia Whipple; Committee on Indian Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 8972) to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire, exchange, transfer, and sell certain tracts of real estate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 8973) to provide for the disposition of asphalt, gilsonite, elaterite, and other like substances on the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 8974) authorizing the packing of oleomargarine and adulterated butter in tin and other suitable packages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 8975) to amend section 91 of the Judicial Code, as amended, so as to create a new division in the western judicial district of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAJOR: A bill (H. R. 8976) directing the Department of Justice to furnish statement as to cost of prohibition enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 8977) for the erection of a public building at Louisville, Winston County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DIES: A bill (H. R. 8978) to clarify the application of the contract labor provisions of the immigration laws to singers and choristers; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8979) to liberalize the disability allowances for World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 8980) to provide for the sale of a portion of the site of the post-office and custom-house building in Newark, N. J., to the city of Newark for use as a public street; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8981) to provide for the sale of an easement for a railway right of way over the post-office and

customhouse site at Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 8982) to give certain civil-service employees of the War Department credit, under the retirement act of May 22, 1920, and such act as amended, for service rendered as telephone operators between March 1, 1918, and August 15, 1925, inclusive; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 8983) authorizing a bond issue for the relief of unemployment, providing for the expenditures thereof, creating a Department of Public Work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 8984) to authorize the licensing of patents owned by the United States; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8985) for the improvement of Boston Harbor, Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 8986) for the improvement of Boston Harbor, Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HERR: A bill (H. R. 8987) to amend the national prohibition act, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVETTE: A bill (H. R. 8988) for the relief of unemployed; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 8989) to insure payment of bank deposits in national banks and member banks of the Federal reserve system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A bill (H. R. 8990) to authorize the purchase of tobacco from funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 8991) to require all insurance corporations formed under the provisions of Chapter XVIII of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to maintain their principal office and places of business within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 8992) to amend the naturalization laws in respect of residence requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8993) to liberalize the disability allowances for World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 8994) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Cherokee, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 8995) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to readjust and close streets, roads, highways, or alleys, in the District of Columbia, rendered useless or unnecessary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLLINS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 279) classifying certain official mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 280) to create a commission on the coordination of Federal and State taxation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLOOM: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) granting the consent of Congress for the temporary removal to the Corcoran Art Gallery of certain portraits in the Capitol Building; to the Committee on the Library.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

House Joint Memorial No. 2, of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADKINS: A bill (H. R. 8996) granting a pension to Martin W. Westbay; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8997) granting an increase of pension to Ruth J. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8998) granting a pension to Georgia L. Spelce; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 8999) granting a pension to Bishop Creech; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 9000) to authorize the Secretary of War to pay to R. B. Baugh, doctor of medicine, certain money due him for services rendered as a member of the local board of Smith County, Miss.; operated during the World War; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 9001) granting a pension to Anna M. D'Autrechy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DE PRIEST: A bill (H. R. 9002) for the relief of Harry T. Brewer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIES: A bill (H. R. 9003) for the relief of Walter M. Rowlett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 9004) for the relief of Agnes C. Reder; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9005) for the relief of Clarence W. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 9006) granting a pension to Oma B. Brewer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9007) granting a pension to Bertha Davison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 9008) providing compensation to M. J. Harbinson for injuries sustained while in the Government service at and on the Belknap Reservation, Mont., engaged as a moundsman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9009) for the relief of A. N. Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 9010) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Swing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 9011) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Limes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 9012) for the relief of George E. Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9013) for the relief of J. B. Herrington; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 9014) for the relief of Robert Sydney Stapleton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9015) granting an increase of pension to Peggy Shade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9016) granting a pension to Francis M. Weddle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOPER: A bill (H. R. 9017) granting a pension to Clara Fruin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERR: A bill (H. R. 9018) for the relief of Robert Emil Taylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 9019) for the relief of Anna R. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 9020) granting a pension to Louisa F. Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9021) granting a pension to Bess B. Mills; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9022) to correct the military record of Joseph A. Roland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9023) granting a pension to Mammie Smothers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9024) granting a pension to Gertrude A. Foley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEMP: A bill (H. R. 9025) for the relief of the heirs of James and Porter Henry; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 9026) to reimburse the city of Frederick, Md., for moneys paid to a Confederate army on July 9, 1864, under penalty of burning such city; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 9027) granting a pension to Albert Lemons; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 9028) granting a pension to Harriet B. Gilmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUGIN: A bill (H. R. 9029) granting a pension to Mary J. Whistler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9030) for the relief of Andy M. Swanson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9031) for the relief of D. H. Robinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9032) for the relief of Karl Keith Sherman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 9033) for the relief of William F. Trice; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 9034) for the relief of Allen F. Maclean; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 9035) for the relief of the heirs of Wells C. McCool; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 9036) granting an increase of pension to Margaret B. Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9037) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Greer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9038) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Hendershot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 9039) granting a pension to Albert A. Latulippe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 9040) for the relief of Oscar W. Behrens; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9041) granting an increased annuity to Thomas A. Kelly; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 9042) granting a pension to Kate H. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 9043) granting an increase of pension to Emeline J. McLane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 9044) granting an increase of pension to Amelia J. Wharram; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9045) granting a pension to Susan J. Raab; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTPHIN: A bill (H. R. 9046) for the relief of Daniel J. Gallagher, jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 9047) granting an increase of pension to Salena Hendrickson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9048) granting an increase of pension to Anna Trimbur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 9049) granting a pension to Electa Wood Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 9050) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah C. Rice; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9051) granting a pension to Robert Garrett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9052) granting a pension to Esther Simpson Bingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9053) for the relief of Carl C. Baxter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 9054) granting a pension to Harry F. DeBroux; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1405. By Mr. ADKINS: Petition of citizens of Mattoon, Ill., protesting against any measure that will modify, resubmit to the States, or repeal the present prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1406. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of Walter Blackburn and 60 others, of Westerly, R. I., protesting against passage of Senate bill 1202; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1407. By Mr. AYRES: Petition of Friends and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Argonia, Kans., supporting the prohibition law and its enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1408. By Mr. BACON: Petition of sundry citizens of Freeport, N. Y., circulated at Freeport Methodist Episcopal Church, opposing modification of prohibition law and resubmission or repeal of eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1409. Also, petition transmitted by chapter of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Beechhurst, Long Island, containing 38 names, opposing modification or repeal of prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1410. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the National Guard Association of the State of New York, favoring the erection of a memorial at Washington, D. C., or in any other place in the United States, to the National Guard of the United States that served in the World War; to the Committee on the Library.

1411. Also, petition of Federal Postal Employees' Association (Inc.), of Denver, Colo., emphatically protesting any reduction in the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1412. Also, petition of residents of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill, S. 1202, providing for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia, or any other compulsory religious measures that have been or shall be introduced, such as House bill 8092; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1413. By Mr. BOILEAU: Petition of H. J. Secord and 50 other members of the Veterans of All Wars of America, requesting the repeal or modification of the national prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1414. By Mr. BRUNNER: Resolution of the Long Island Real Estate Board, protesting against the enactment of any bill by Congress which would restore the stamp tax of 50 cents per \$500 on real-estate transfers, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1415. Also, resolution of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, protesting against the passage of any measures by Congress which would tend to reduce the salaries of Federal employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1416. Also, resolution of the Forest Hills Civic Association, Forest Hills, N. Y., indorsing House bill 7620, to create Federal home loan banks and urging Congress to favorably pass same; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1417. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Lois C. Hedly and 42 other residents of Portsmouth, Newport, and Middletown, R. I., opposing repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1418. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of Mrs. K. M. Cotter and 42 members of Court St. Mary, No. 929, of Hancock, N. Y., opposing enactment of Federal department of education bill and infancy and maternity bill, House bills 4757 and 4739, respectively; to the Committee on Education.

1419. Also, petition of 48 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Deposit, and W. H. Richards and 26 citizens of Oneonta, all of the State of New York, opposing modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment and prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1420. By Mr. CONNERY: Memorial of Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, protesting against cut of appropriations to carry out the provisions and policy of the national defense act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1421. By Mr. CRAWL: Petition of Compton Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Compton, Calif., strongly opposing any efforts to repeal, revise, resubmit, or nullify the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1422. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of Mrs. J. Augustus and six other citizens of Arlington, Mass., opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1423. By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of 131 residents of Camden, N. Y., opposing any change in the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1424. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local No. 81, Pittsburgh, Pa., setting forth the conditions of employment with regard to substitute postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1425. Also, petition of the Nowata County (Okla.) Central Committee, protesting against extension of any further moratoriums on debts owed us by foreign nations or against any further revision thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1426. Also, petition of the public defense committee of the Okmulgee (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce, urging continuance of the citizen's military training camps and the military training provided in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1427. Also, petition of reserve officers of Payne County, Okla., supporting appropriations for national defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1428. Also, petition of the O. K. Cooperative Milk Association (Inc.) Oklahoma City, Okla., protesting against the repeal of the agricultural marketing act or any amendment abolishing the Federal Farm Board or transferring the functions of same to any other Government department and expressing appreciation of the efforts of the Federal Farm Board in assisting farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative marketing organizations; also protesting against bringing into cultivation any new areas of farm lands by Government construction of irrigation or reclamation projects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1429. Also, petition of the Alva (Okla.) Roller Mills, urging support of House bill 48; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1430. Also, petition of Victory Post, No. 4, American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, urging passage of Senate bill 2263, transferring veterans, wives of disabled veterans, and widows of deceased veterans now employed on temporary appointments in the Census Bureau to the classified civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1431. Also, petition of the chamber of commerce and agriculture, McAlester, Okla., urging support of House bill 5659, authorizing the Department of Justice to investigate the revolutionary activities and propaganda of the communists in the United States; also urging support of House bill 1967, providing for strengthening the immigration laws to prevent the admission of communists into the United States and providing for the immediate deportation of all alien communists; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1432. By Mr. GILLEN: Petition of Fort Harrison Post, No. 40, American Legion, Terre Haute, Ind., relating to local and special hospitalization of disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1433. By Mr. GLOVER: Resolution of Grand Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of Stuttgart, Ark.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1434. By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Petition supporting the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1435. By Mr. GREENWOOD: Petition of Isaac Wampler, of Odon, Ind., and 71 other citizens, protesting against the

enactment of any law which provides for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1436. By Mr. HOCH: Petition of C. A. Berkeheiser and 128 other citizens of White City, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1437. Also, petition of First Methodist Episcopal congregation of Madison, Kans., representing 500 people, urging the Congressman to vote against resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures, and to vote for adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1438. Also, petition of members of the Local Institute of Burlingame, signed by Bess Cones McRae and 132 other citizens of Burlingame, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1439. Also, petition of members of the Queen Ester Class, Methodist Episcopal Sunday school, of White City, Kans., membership of 55, urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1440. Also, petition of members of the Sans Souci Club, of White City, Kans., membership of 30, urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1441. Also, petition of members of the Methodist Episcopal Sunday school of Le Roy, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1442. Also, petition of members of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Michigan Valley, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1443. Also, petition of members of the United Presbyterian Sunday School of Emporia, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1444. Also, petition of members of the Methodist Episcopal Sunday school of Piedmont, Kans., representing 21 people, urging the Congressman to vote against resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures, and to vote for adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1445. Also, petition of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Emporia, Kans., urging the Congressmen to vote against resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures, and to vote for adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1446. Also, petition of Sybil L. Pocock and 45 other citizens of Le Roy, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1447. Also, petition of Fred L. Chamberlin and 44 other citizens of Eureka, Climax, Severy, Hamilton, and Fall River, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1448. Also, petition of members of the official board of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Osage City, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1449. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Reba Spence and 60 others, of Lewis, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement, and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1450. Also, petition of Jennie Field and 52 others, of Arnold, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement, and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1451. Also, petition of Lora Adams and 180 others, of Ness City, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement, and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1452. Also, petition of Mrs. T. B. Turner and 26 others, of Hazelton, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement, and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1453. Also, petition of Della Mathis and 43 others, of Burdett, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement, and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1454. Also, petition of Mrs. W. E. Wray and 20 others, of Brownell, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement, and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1455. Also, petition of Mrs. Will Weltmer and 44 others, of Hanston, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement, and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1456. Also, petition of Leonore Duncan and 52 others, of Alden, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement, and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1457. Also, petition of Nellie Howell and 97 others of Ashland, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement, and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1458. Also, petition of Mrs. G. G. Hays and 45 others, of Utica, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement, and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1459. Also, petition of Mrs. D. F. Thompson and 32 others, of Jetmore, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1460. Also, petition of Dora Bloom and 114 others, of Anthony, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement and

protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1461. Also, petition of Don E. Smith and 229 others, of Greensburg, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1462. Also, petition of Robert Hood and 214 others, of Sterling, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1463. Also, petition of J. W. Bergen and others, of Ransom, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1464. Also, petition of Josephine Stewart and Mrs. George McNabb, of Nashville, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1465. Also, petition of Genevieve Kempner and Cora Kepner, of Nickerson, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1466. Also, petition of Maggie Chenoworth and Elsie M. Showalter, of McCracken, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1467. By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of Mrs. V. Pennington and numerous other residents, of Birmingham, Ala., favoring the maintenance of the prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1468. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Sweetwater Board of City Development, Sweetwater, Tex., opposing Federal tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1469. Also, petition of Texas Cotton Cooperative Association, favoring continuance of Federal farm marketing act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1470. Also, petition of Claud L. McIver and 890 ex-service men of Madison and Leon Counties, Tex., favoring immediate payment in cash of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1471. Also, petition of the president and members of the executive board of Local Union 183, Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, Austin, Tex., favoring House bill 5495; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1472. Also, petition of the president and members of the executive board of Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, of Austin, Tex., favoring legislation within the District of Columbia making it unlawful to keep barber shops open on Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1473. Also, petition of American Legion and American Legion Auxiliary of Bryan, Tex., favoring widows' and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1474. By Mr. KELLER: Resolution of the Zeigler Central Labor Union, of Zeigler, Ill., guaranteeing bank deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1475. Also, petition of the citizens of Logan, Ill., favoring payment of the bonus certificates; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1476. Also, petition of the Ladies' Home Missionary Society of Steeleville, Ill., opposing any repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1477. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of William Resch, Joe Sommers, Mary Wethmueller, and others, petitioning Congress to enact at this time such legislation as is necessary to curb the activities of the growing monopolistic organizations throughout the country commonly known as the chain-store

system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1478. Also, petition of Geo. O. Fenniken, Mrs. R. H. Beymer, John Bader, and others, petitioning Congress to enact at this time such legislation as is necessary to curb the activities of the growing monopolistic organizations throughout the country commonly known as the chain-store system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1479. Also, petition of C. A. Withrow, J. W. Thomas, Mrs. J. W. Thomas, H. W. Albright, and others, petitioning Congress to enact legislation which is believed to be necessary at this time to curb the activities of the growing monopolistic organizations throughout the country commonly known as the chain-store system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1480. Also, petition of Fred Raine, G. L. Wright, Robert C. Loucks, and others, petitioning Congress to enact legislation which is believed to be necessary at this time to curb the activities of the growing monopolistic organizations throughout the country commonly known as the chain-store system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1481. Also, petition of Steward M. Rush, Wesley Hummel, W. H. Snyder, and others, petitioning Congress to enact legislation which is believed to be necessary at this time to curb the activities of the growing monopolistic organizations throughout the country commonly known as the chain-store system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1482. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Associated Hotel Operators, favoring the modification of the Volstead Prohibition Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1483. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the passage of Senate bill 482; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

1484. Also, petition of the American Agricultural Chemical Co., opposing Muscle Shoals legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1485. Also, petition of Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations (Inc.), of Greater New York, favoring the passage of legislation by the Congress in amending the immigration laws that lawfully married couples—one party an American citizen and the other a foreigner—be permitted entry into the United States on the nonquota basis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1486. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the passage of Senate bill 1676 and House bill 4726; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1487. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of R. S. Drake, G. L. Paschat, Troy Williams, R. W. Arnold, Flora Fulp, John Benton, J. A. Crowell, Elmer Parks, Nora Hood, J. F. Moore, W. O. Gray, and 165 others, requesting Congress to issue non-interest-paying bonds in small denominations to be used in payment of debts in a similar manner in which United States currency is now used; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1488. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Petition of Jennie E. Lipe and 19 other residents of Manistee, Mich., protesting against modification, repeal, or resubmission to the States of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1489. By Mr. MILLARD: Petition signed by citizens of Westchester County, in the State of New York, requesting support for the citizens' military training camps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1490. By Mr. MOREHEAD: Petition of persons seriously objecting to the Copeland Sunday bill for the closing up of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1491. By Mr. MURPHY: Petition of A. P. Rose, secretary Smithfield Grange, Smithfield, Ohio, and 32 other members of that grange, asking that all international disputes be settled by arbitration, and that the Army and Navy appropriations be cut to the lowest notch; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1492. Also, petition of Carl E. Sutton, of Steubenville, Ohio, and 24 other oil producers of eastern Ohio, asking that

a duty of \$3 per barrel be placed on crude oil and its by-products and insisting that our Navy, Army, and all our Federal departments use oil and its by-products produced in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1493. By Mr. NELSON of Maine: Petition of L. J. Lord and 45 other citizens, of Frankfort, Me., urging Federal regulation of highway trucks and bus lines to place them on a parity with railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1494. By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Highland Grange, No. 288, of Highland, Ulster County, N. Y., representing about 200 persons, urging retention of the prohibition amendment and opposing modification, repeal, or resubmission to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1495. Also, petition of 16 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Port Ewen, Ulster County, N. Y., urging retention of the prohibition amendment and opposing modification, repeal, or resubmission to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1496. Also, petition of 25 residents of Wallkill, Ulster County, N. Y., urging retention of the prohibition amendment and opposing modification, repeal, or resubmission to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1497. Also, petition of 28 members of Lloyd Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Highland, Ulster County, N. Y., opposing resubmission of the prohibition amendment to the States, and praying for law enforcement and education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1498. By Mr. RAINEY: Resolution of Federal Postal Employees Association (Inc.), of Denver, Colo., in the matter of reduction in the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Rules.

1499. By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition signed by L. W. Lansing, of Dyersville, Iowa, and 10 other citizens of that community, strongly urging the support and passage of House bill 7797; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1500. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Rockaway Bird Club, Rockaway, Long Island, N. Y., favoring the establishment of the Everglades national park in Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1501. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, opposing the passage of Senate bill 3215; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1502. Also, petition of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, New York City, favoring the establishment of the Everglades national park in Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1503. Also, petition of E. F. Hutton & Co., New York City, opposing the passage of the Capper bill (S. 96) and similar bills now pending in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1504. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the passage of Senate bill 482, enacting Federal legislation that will make effective the international code of carriage of goods by sea; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

1505. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the passage of Senate bill 1676 and House bill 4726, providing for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1506. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, opposing the passage of Senate bill 3215; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1507. Also, petition of the American Agricultural Chemical Co., New York City, protesting against enactment of any legislation now before the Military Affairs Committee for the disposition of Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1508. Also, petition of Associated Hotel Operators, favoring the modification or revision of the prohibition laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1509. Also, petition of Latham Litho & Printing Co., Long Island City, favoring Everglades national park in Florida bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1510. Also, petition of James H. Cruikshank, 45 Nassau Street, New York City, and William G. L. Betsch, 339 Washington Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Everglades national park in Florida bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1511. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Mrs. Fred Cowen and other citizens of Medina, N. Y., supporting the prohibition law and its enforcement, and against modification, resubmission, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1512. Also, petition of Grace O. Young and others, urging the support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1513. Also, petition of F. Loraine Miller and other citizens of Medina, N. Y., supporting the prohibition law and its enforcement, and against modification, resubmission, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1514. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution of the Bluefield Chamber of Commerce, Bluefield, W. Va., favoring a tariff on imported fuel oils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1515. Also, resolution adopted by the members of the West Virginia Hotels Association, in behalf of the modification of the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1516. Also, resolution of the Dunbar Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Dunbar, W. Va., opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1517. By Mr. SNOW: Petition of Otis Flannery and other citizens of Fort Fairfield, Me., requesting the enactment of appropriate legislation to place highway trucks and bus lines under regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1518. Also, petition of F. H. Haines and other citizens of Fairmount, Me., requesting the enactment of appropriate legislation to place highway trucks and bus lines under regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1519. Also, petition of A. W. Larson and other citizens of Jemtland, Me., requesting the enactment of appropriate legislation to place highway trucks and bus lines under regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1520. By Mr. STOKES: Memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring adherence to the Permanent Court of International Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1521. Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, asking for reduced Federal expenses and protesting against passage of the La Follette-Costigan bill; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1522. By Mr. SWICK: Petition of West Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, New Castle, Lawrence County, Pa., opposing the approval of Congress for the proposed resolution to submit the eighteenth amendment to the State legislatures or conventions for repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1523. Also, petition of Woman's Missionary Society, Presbyterian Church, Mars, Butler County, Pa., opposing the proposed resolution to submit the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the State legislatures or State conventions for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1524. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Frank Litter, R. D. 3, Canonsburg, Pa., supporting House bill 6041, increasing the rate of pensions for veterans of Indian wars and widows of veterans of Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

1525. Also, petition of Jessop Steel Co., Washington, Pa., protesting against a tax on automobile vehicles, trucks, accessories, and tires; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1526. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of the Makefield Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Dolington, Pa., opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1527. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of citizens of Henderson County, N. C., opposing Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1528. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, favoring the establishment of a postgraduate naval school at Berkeley, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1529. By Mr. WOLVERTON: Petition of various citizens of Elmer, Yorktown, Daretown, and Woodstown, N. J., supporting the eighteenth amendment and its enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1932

(Legislative day of Friday, February 5, 1932)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the President of the United States.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Several messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on February 8, 1932, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 355) providing for the participation of the United States in A Century of Progress (the Chicago World's Fair Centennial Celebration), to be held at Chicago, Ill., in 1933, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2173) to authorize associations of employees in the District of Columbia to adopt a device to designate the products of the labor of their members, to punish illegal use or imitation of such device, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1306) to provide for the incorporation of the District of Columbia Commission, George Washington Bicentennial, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution to authorize the Committee on Finance to have printed additional copies of the hearings on sale of foreign bonds or securities in the United States; and

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to correct certain errors in the reenrollment of the bill (S. 2199) exempting building and loan associations from being adjudged bankrupts.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 149) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near The Dalles, Oreg., and it was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Blaine	Capper	Cutting
Austin	Borah	Caraway	Dale
Bailey	Bratton	Carey	Dickinson
Bankhead	Brookhart	Connally	Dill
Barbour	Broussard	Coolidge	Fess
Barkley	Bulkley	Copeland	Fletcher
Bingham	Bulow	Costigan	Frazier
Black	Byrnes	Couzens	George